Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF JESUS

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO · DALLAS
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF JESUS

According to the First Three Gospels

BY

EDWARD INCREASE BOSWORTH

NEW TESTAMENT PROFESSOR IN THE OBERLIN GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1924

All rights reserved

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY

COPYRIGHT, 1924,
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Set up and printed.
Published March, 1924.

Printed in the United States of America by
J. J. LITTLE AND IVES COMPANY, NEW YORK

2329
B747

To the Memory of
MY MOTHER

373335

FOREWORD

At the center of the Christian religion stands a person, whose name is more and more on the lips of all men either in cursing or blessing. If the religious motive is to press with new power on the huge masses of men now crowded so closely, and sometimes so fiercely, upon each other, there must be many attempts made to gain a fresh view of this central figure. As each of these various attempts is followed by some measure of success, a new measure of the energy of the underlying, vitalizing will of God will rise in the hearts of men for this day of their great endeavor. It has been so before in the history of the Christian centuries: "Wherever Christianity has struck out a new path in her journey it has been because the personality of Jesus had again become living and a ray from its Being had once more illumined the world."

It is for this reason that the present book is added to the many "Lives" of Jesus that have been written and that ought in still larger numbers to be written. It will endeavor to present the life of Jesus in the terms of a real religious experience. The author just quoted has also said that "in no other religion has a personality ever won a significance in any way approaching that of Christ's in the Christian religion." [1] This unique significance seems to be due to Jesus' profound religious experience. This personal experience of Jesus, with all that it in-

[1] Bousset, *What is Religion*, pp. 237, 238.

volves, is the world's most valuable asset. It furnishes ground for the kind of authority that modern men most readily recognize, authority based on experience, the authority of "the man who knows" because he has had experience. Jesus seemed conscious of possessing such authority. It will become evident that a part of his religious experience consisted in the feeling that he was being made by God personally responsible for leadership in the religious life of man, that he could and must "save" men by leading them to share his own religious experience.

It was inevitable that Jesus' religious experience should be described in the various terms available for this purpose in his day. This necessity must have been felt not only by the followers of Jesus but by Jesus himself. He had to give an account of himself to himself in the terms of his own thought world. It is only as we in some measure penetrate the real religious experience back of these terms that we shall feel the power of Jesus' personality in this day of the world's great need. When this is done men have a chance to decide whether they really care to follow his leadership and share his experience.

In the providence of God at this time of the world's great need of the religion of Jesus Christ, there are available for a study of his life the results of more than a century of devout critical scholarship. This book, planned by the editor of the series for college students, but written also for all of similar outlook on life, should show a teacher's familiarity with these results although technical discussions will not often appear.

The presentation is based chiefly upon the first three Gospels, with only occasional references to the Fourth Gospel, because the constant use of that Gospel would

involve a discussion of critical questions impossible within the scope of this book. The author has been willing to make this limitation because the conclusions reached on the basis of the first three Gospels do not seem to him vitally different from those presented in the Gospel of John.

Discussions regarding dates, contemporary history and geography are not introduced inasmuch as they will appear in another volume belonging to the series to which this book belongs.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	The Sources: The Earliest Gospel Makers and Their Times	1
II	The Sources (Concluded): The Four Gospels	10
III	Religion in Palestine as Jesus Found It; Buildings and Sects	23
IV	Religion in Palestine as Jesus Found It (Concluded): The Kingdom of God and the Messianic Hope	38
V	Jesus in Private Life	49
VI	Jesus' Introduction to Public Life . . .	60
VII	The Period of Difficult Decision . . .	70
VIII	Jesus the Greater Successor of the Prophet John: Famous Prophet and Healer Throughout Galilee	81
IX	Jesus the Greater Successor of the Prophet John (Concluded): Teacher and Prophet Rather than Healer . .	91
X	Jesus' Conflict with the Scribes: The Forgiveness of Sins and Intimacy with Sinners	98
XI	Jesus' Conflict with the Scribes (Continued): Fasts and the Sabbath . . .	107
XII	Jesus' Conflict with the Scribes (Concluded): Verdict of the Jerusalem Scribes and Jesus' Attack on Tradition	116

CHAPTER		PAGE
XIII	FOUR WONDERFUL WORKS: THE POWER OF FAITH	126
XIV	EXTENSION OF THE MOVEMENT IN GALILEE THROUGH TRAINED ASSISTANTS	138
XV	JESUS' TEACHING ABOUT READINESS FOR THE COMING KINGDOM	149
XVI	JESUS' TEACHING ABOUT READINESS FOR THE COMING KINGDOM (Continued)	166
XVII	JESUS' TEACHING ABOUT READINESS FOR THE COMING KINGDOM (Concluded)	177
XVIII	JESUS' ESTIMATE OF HIS WORK IN GALILEE: PARABLES OF THE KINGDOM	187
XIX	THE GALILEAN PROPHET AND THE PEOPLE EAT TOGETHER BEFORE THE HEAVENLY FATHER	198
XX	MISCELLANEOUS REMINISCENCES OF JESUS IN THE REGION NORTH AND EAST OF GALILEE	209
XXI	THE MESSIANIC SECRET	222
XXII	THE PROSPECTIVE SUFFERING OF THE SON OF MAN	234
XXIII	HOW AND WHEN JESUS EXPECTED THE KINGDOM OF GOD TO COME	243
XXIV	BEGINNING TO WALK ALONE IN THE WAY OF PAIN	256
XXV	SECRET JOURNEY THROUGH GALILEE; POLITICS AMONG THE TWELVE	264
XXVI	IN THE BORDERLAND OF JUDAEA AND PERAEA; JESUS RESUMES PUBLIC TEACHING	275
XXVII	IN THE BORDERLAND OF JUDAEA AND PERAEA (Concluded): STARTING FOR JERUSALEM	289
XXVIII	WHAT DID MESSIAHSHIP MEAN TO JESUS?	300

CHAPTER		PAGE
XXIX	JESUS IN COLLISION WITH THE PRIESTS: PRIESTS AND SCRIBES COMBINE	308
XXX	CONTINUED CONFLICT WITH THE JERUSALEM PRIESTS AND SCRIBES	320
XXXI	JESUS DENOUNCES THE JERUSALEM SCRIBES .	329
XXXII	JESUS' PRIVATE TEACHING ABOUT THE DESTRUCTION OF JEHOVAH'S HOUSE AND THE END OF THE AGE	337
XXXIII	THE TREACHERY OF A TABLE COMPANION . .	349
XXXIV	JESUS' LAST SUPPER WITH THE TWELVE . .	355
XXXV	JESUS ARRESTED IN THE OIL PRESS GARDEN .	365
XXXVI	THE TRIAL OF JESUS	374
XXXVII	THE EXECUTION OF JESUS	384
XXXVIII	THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS	395

THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF JESUS

THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF JESUS

CHAPTER I

THE SOURCES; THE EARLIEST GOSPEL MAKERS AND THEIR TIMES

THE earliest writings in which the name of Jesus appears are those of the most famous missionary propagator of the Christian movement, the Jewish Rabbi Saul of Tarsus and Jerusalem, who soon after the death of Jesus became the Christian apostle Paul. He was a homeless traveler on land and sea who wished only at any sacrifice of personal comfort to win converts to the movement and in God's good time to be "at home with the Lord." [1] Paul's letters to Christian churches and leaders during a period of less than twenty years, beginning about 48 A.D., contain a few casual allusions to details in the life and teaching of Jesus [2] but afford no important biographical information not contained in the Gospels. The letters do give valuable information regarding the dominant ideas under the influence of which the Gospel material was gathered and shaped into its present form.

The main source of information is the four "Gospels,"

[1] II Cor. XI:23-28, V:6-7.
[2] *E.g.*, Rom. I:3, I Cor. VII:10-11, XI:23-25, II Cor. VIII:9.

the survivors of many other attempts at Gospel making during the decades immediately following the death of Jesus.[3] These documents came in the course of time to be called "Gospels" because they were presentations of "The Gospel"; that is, "The Evangel," or "The Good News" regarding God's purpose to bring in a new era for man through Jesus. There were various versions of this message "according to" one or another of those who undertook to make Gospels; *e.g.,* "The Gospel according to Mark."

Jesus himself, like the great Greek teacher in the University of the Streets of Athens, left no written word behind him. "The Gospels," though not "The Gospel," were the product of the wonderful life that throbbed in the hearts of the followers of Jesus after his death. For more than a century scholars have been trying to reproduce the situation in which the Gospels were made, and especially to account for the perplexing combination of similarity and dissimilarity which characterizes the three Gospels according to Matthew, Mark, and Luke. This is the "synoptic problem." [4] These Gospels contain narrative matter, anecdotes briefly told but possessed of the wonderful interest which the oriental story teller knows how to impart to a brief narrative. They also contain compact, terse, vivid presentations of the "teaching" of Jesus, for Jesus, as will be seen, had exercised the function of a teaching rabbi, although without the conventional preparation for it. A rabbi was accustomed to "sit down" in the midst of his "disciples" and "teach," or lecture to them: Jesus "went up into the mountain

[3] Lk. I:1-4.

[4] The first three Gospels have long been called the "Synoptic Gospels," perhaps because they yield practically the same synopsis, or general view, of the life of Jesus when their contents are arranged for the purpose of comparison.

and when he had sat down his disciples came unto him and he opened his mouth and taught them." [5] The teaching matter and the narrative matter may be considered separately in discussing the Gospel making process.

The teaching matter was subject to two general tendencies during this process, one calculated to preserve the exact form in which it had come from Jesus' lips and the other calculated to modify it. The disciple of a teaching rabbi was trained to remember the exact words of his teacher with reference to passing them on to others. A successful, clear-headed rabbi would put his teaching in such compact, vivid, concrete form that the disciples could "hold it fast." [6] Rabbi Johanan, a contemporary of Jesus, said of one of his best disciples, Eliezer, that he was "a plastered cistern which loseth not a drop." [7] The Jewish Talmud was long preserved in the powerful memories of generations of disciples. Its earlier portions were not put in written form until the third century A.D. Possibly some disciples made temporary use of written notes taken at the time of the lecture, but this evidence of weakness may well have been considered with the same disfavor that Elspeth Macfadyen, the "sermon taster" of Drumtochty, felt for note taking in sermon time. The teaching of Jesus that has come down to us shows him to have been a most skillful teacher. Many of his teachings were so terse, paradoxical, vividly pictorial and concrete that when once heard they could never be forgotten. In addition to this fact his disciples had unusual incentive and opportunity to fix his teaching firmly in mind. As will be seen later the main subject of his teaching was peculiarly exciting,

[5] Mt. V:1-2.
[6] Lk. VIII:15.
[7] Pirke Aboth 2:10.

"the Kingdom of Heaven at hand" which meant to many, "the end of the world near"; the disciples were sent out by him to reproduce his teaching as apprentice rabbis; they came back to him with reports of what they had done and taught [8] to have any misapprehensions corrected by him; and especially the growing conviction that their rabbi was to be the Messianic leader sent by God made their minds alert. After his death, during the short period which they expected would intervene before his return from heaven, they had strong incentive to recall and teach his words. In his teaching he had showed men how to live in order to be ready for "the Coming Kingdom." His disciples now felt it to be their urgent duty to continue this work and pass on to all who would listen Jesus' teaching about the way to get ready for the Great Event. All this tended to fix the exact form of the teaching in their memory.

On the other hand there were certain influences operative in the Gospel making period which tended to modify this well set, inherited body of teaching. There were "prophets and teachers" among the early Christian leaders.[9] These Christian prophets and teachers were men of independence, considered to be acting under the direct inspiration of the Spirit of God, and to be directly acquainted with the mind of Jesus after he had been taken into the heavens. Their conception of their relation to Jesus appears in the words attributed to Peter when he was speaking as a "prophet": "Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit he (Jesus) hath poured forth this which ye do see and hear." [10]

[8] Mk. VI:7, 30.
[9] Acts XIII:1.
[10] Acts II:17, 33.

That a "prophet" in his "spiritual" independence would not hesitate to put words on the lips of Jesus in heaven appears in the Book of the Revelation of the Prophet John. There John the "prophet" repeatedly ventures to put on the lips of Jesus words that have always appealed powerfully to the Christian heart, for instance: "Behold I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice and open the door I will come in to him and will sup with him and he with me. He that overcometh, I will give to him to sit down with me in my throne as I also overcame and sat down with my Father in his throne." [11]

While the inherited words of Jesus would always have been a norm in the Gospel making period, the independent spirit of the Christian prophets and teachers would have felt authorized to make consistent additions to, or explanations of, the words of Jesus. These additions would naturally have become part of the authoritative words of Jesus. They would have been regarded as Jesus' continuation of his teaching through his prophets and teachers. This would especially have been true in the earliest period when the speedy return of Jesus was a constant expectation and no idea of arbitrary limits was connected with the teachings remembered by his various disciples.

There were certain features of the Gospel making period that specially incited the prophets and teachers to use their authority. The period was one of controversy with non-Christian Jews. Jesus appeared to many such to have been an outrageous blasphemer whom God's hot wrath had cursed with death by crucifixion. Whenever in this bitter controversy it was found that words of Jesus were being misunderstood and used to his discredit it would have seemed plain duty so to modify his words

[11] Rev. XXII:8-9, III:20-21.

as to bring out their true meaning and prevent their misuse.

The prophets and teachers felt the influence of another incentive to modify the teaching in order to increase its usefulness. It will be shown later that for a considerable time Jesus did not make known his sense of mission in its full dimensions. His Messianic consciousness was a secret.[12] Some of his words, therefore, took on a new meaning afterward when they were remembered with full realization of who it was that had spoken them. In such cases it sometimes seemed necessary so to re-phrase the statements as to make their real significance clear.

Furthermore, as the teachers and prophets taught the words of Jesus to evangelists or to those being prepared to enter the organization that in the course of no long time began to be called "the church," various helpful homiletical explanations of the words of Jesus would become fixed in form and incorporated into the body of his teaching.

The situation in regard to narrative matter was somewhat different. No original disciple of Jesus would have definitely set himself to fasten on his mind a picture of Jesus in action. It was the business of a disciple to remember the words of his rabbi but not to photograph his actions. The narrative portions of the Gospels are miscellaneous anecdotes long current among Jesus' followers, used, as often in ancient biographies of distinguished men, to reveal the true character of the subject of the biography. In the case of great men there is always a tendency to mix legendary matter with fact. It is not due to conscious effort to deceive or exaggerate. It is due to the respectful or reverent feeling that such things are what we should expect from so great a person.

[12] Mk. VIII:29-30.

Devout conjecture naturally passes into conviction. It is the mind's instinctive tribute to greatness. Some matter that appears to us unhistorical is found in the Gospel narrative; for instance, the statement that a good many graves in the vicinity of Jerusalem were opened, and that resurrected bodies in large numbers were seen walking the Jerusalem streets at the time when Jesus died and rose again.[13]

The ease with which the various modifying influences might operate to a certain extent on the Gospel making process in the case of both teaching and narrative matter is clearer when we realize that the process was probably a far more democratic one than we have sometimes thought. Many nameless prophets, teachers and evangelists had a part in it. The Spirit of God would have been expected to work in democratic ways, especially in a period when it was understood that the Spirit of God was being poured out in democratic fashion on all flesh.[14] That this democratic tendency was felt by many earnest people in the later stages of the Gospel making process has always been evident from the prologue to the third Gospel: "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to draw up a narrative concerning those matters which have been fulfilled among us . . . it seemed good to me also . . . to write." [15]

The process by which the Gospels were formed, shows that they were not intended to be an expression of sheer authority, calculated to overawe the soul of man and bring it to unquestioning submission to dogmas and rules of life. This would be detrimental to the formation of character. They were intended to beget a certain disposition

[13] Mt. XXVII: 52-53.
[14] Acts II:17.
[15] Lk. I:1-3.

toward life, to start men out on a sincere adventure into the religious experience of Jesus.

So far we have considered only certain general influences operating both to preserve and to modify the Gospel material in the Gospel making period. There was one other important and more specific feature in the situation. Palestine was at this time a bi-lingual country, like parts of Bohemia before the war. Both Aramaic, a language akin to Hebrew, and Greek were in use among the people. Greek life and language had penetrated Palestine, especially in the northern part, Galilee. Even in Jerusalem, in the south, there had been a circus and theatre in which Greek games and gladiatorial contests were witnessed from time to time. As is generally the case in a bi-lingual country many preferred one language to the other, and some knew only one. Many Jews came back from Jewish colonies in foreign parts knowing only Greek and plenty of home born Jews probably knew only Aramaic. All through the Gospel making period, therefore, the Gospel matter must have existed in both languages. After it had become necessary to put this matter into written form it would have been circulating in three and perhaps four forms: oral Aramaic and Greek, written Greek and perhaps written Aramaic. There would also have been variety in each of these forms.

What forms of the Gospel material lay immediately behind our first three Gospels? It is possible here only to state the main conclusions now quite generally accepted. Our Greek Gospel according to Mark is the oldest of the three. Perhaps behind it was an earlier form of it only slightly different. This Gospel, in its earlier or later form, was used by the compilers of our Matthew and Luke. They both used also another main written source, which afterward disappeared as an independent docu-

ment, namely, a collection of the teachings of Jesus commonly referred to as Q ("Quelle," "source"). They used Mark, which is composed largely of narrative matter, as a narrative framework. If they used Mark in its present form, they occasionally changed its order of events. Into this framework of narrative they inserted at intervals sections from Q, the collection of teachings. A minimum reconstruction of Q, therefore, would consist of those teachings of Jesus found in both Matthew and Luke, but not in Mark. However, some of Q may be also in Mark. It may be, also, that neither the compiler of our Matthew nor of our Luke used all of Q. There may be some teaching found in Matthew only or in Luke only which nevertheless came from Q. It is sometimes imagined that Q (in this case used only as a symbol for teaching in general) existed in several different collections and that our Matthew and our Luke represent different forms of Q. The compilers of the Matthew and Luke Gospel both used other sources written or oral in addition to Mark and Q. They have divergent narratives about the birth and infancy of Jesus. In the Matthew Gospel a great many references to Old Testament prophecies appear, probably taken from a very early collection of "testimonia," that is, Old Testament passages to be used for defending the Messiahship of Jesus in controversies with the Jews. Luke seems to have had access to a somewhat extensive source containing some very beautiful teaching and interesting narrative not found in any other of our Gospels, for instance, the good Samaritan, Mary and Martha entertaining Jesus, the prodigal son, the rich man and Lazarus, the Pharisee and the Publican at prayer, the ten lepers, Jesus in the home of Zacchaeus, the penitent brigand on the cross, the two disciples meeting Jesus on the way to Emmaus, etc.

CHAPTER II

THE SOURCES (*Concluded*): THE FOUR GOSPELS

IT remains to describe briefly each of our four Gospels. Each of them in its purpose and characteristics shows the influence of the section of the church in which it was compiled. This is what we should expect for each Gospel was an earnest, practical attempt to bring the influence of the memorable deeds and words of Jesus to bear upon local or class needs until the time, not far distant, when the Lord himself should come back from heaven to earth.

The Gospel according to Mark was apparently intended for non-Jewish readers, "Gentiles." It contains explanations of Jewish customs that would not have been necessary for Jews. For instance: "Some of his disciples ate their bread with defiled, that is, unwashed, hands. For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands diligently, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders, and when they come from the market place except they bathe themselves they eat not; and many other things there are which they have received to hold, washing of cups and pots and brasen vessels." [1]

The Gospel compiler had in mind Gentiles who had not yet become Christians, for he makes very slight reference to the Jewish scriptures. Gentiles who had become Chris-

[1] Mk. VII:2-4.

tians would thereafter be much interested in the sacred Jewish scriptures with their impressive predictions. The orthodox Gentile Christians, in spite of their prejudice against the Jews, appropriated the Jewish scriptures without any scruples as modern Christians have done.

The Gospel according to Mark shows evangelists how to meet three outstanding Gentile objections to the Christian presentation of Jesus. The first objection is this: If Jesus was the Jewish Messiah, why did his own countrymen not at once accept him? The answer is that he did not let them know that he was the Messiah. He concealed the fact until the very end of his life.[2] The second objection is this: If Jesus really had the character of a kingly gracious Messiah, even though he concealed his rank, how could his countrymen have turned against him and crucified him? The answer is that they did not turn against him; he was a popular hero from beginning to end. It was the ecclesiastical machine that killed him, because envious of his great popularity, as the Roman procurator very well knew.[3] The third is this: If he was God's all-powerful Messiah why did he allow his envious enemies to put him to death? The answer is that he felt it to be God's will that he should be killed; only by such a death could he accomplish his Messianic purpose.[4] Incidentally also pains are taken in this Gospel to show that Jesus did not share one Jewish prejudice which made the Jews very ridiculous and unpopular among Gentiles. When a Roman Emperor a few years after the death of Jesus was hurrying through his palace and gardens to inspect improvements that were being made and a dignified delegation of Alexandrian Jews was racing after him to get a chance

[2] Mk. VIII:27-30, XIV:55, 61-62.
[3] Mk. I:45, III:7-8, XIV:1-2, XV:9-10.
[4] Mk. VIII:31, IX:12, 31, X:45.

to present their case piecemeal, he suddenly turned upon them and raised a great laugh among his obsequious attendants by asking why they did not eat pork.[5] The laugh probably went all over Rome. Mark's Gospel expressly represents Jesus by implication to have abolished this unpopular requirement in the law of Moses.[6] No Gentile need hesitate to become a follower of the Jewish Messiah for fear of having to give up eating pork, oysters or rabbits.

A tradition of the early church connects this Gospel with Rome. A still earlier tradition ascribes the Gospel to Mark, whom it represents to have been the reporter ("interpreter") of the apostle Peter. Papias, a Bishop in Asia Minor about 125 or 135 A.D., quotes an earlier man "The Elder": "And the Elder said this also: Mark having become the interpreter of Peter wrote down accurately everything that he remembered, without, however, recording in order what was either said or done by Christ. (What follows may be the words of Papias himself.) For neither did he hear the Lord nor did he follow him; but afterwards as I said (attended) Peter who adapted his instructions to the needs (of his hearers?) but had no design of giving an account of the Lord's oracles (variant reading, 'words'). So then Mark made no mistake while he thus wrote some things as he remembered them, for he made it his one care not to omit anything that he heard or to set down any false statement therein."[7] This language indicates that Mark's Gospel, which we consider very valuable because of its priority to the others, was at first not so highly esteemed. The Elder or Papias seems to be defending it against criticism. It seemed a dis-

[5] Philo, *On the Virtues of Ambassadors*, 45; *cf.* Juvenal Sat. XIV.
[6] Mk. VII:19.
[7] Quoted in Eusebius, *Church History*, III:39.

orderly Gospel, miscellaneous and ill arranged, especially, perhaps, as compared with the careful chronological reference to feasts, days and even hours to be found in the Fourth Gospel. It had no such fine body of oracles, or words of Jesus, as were contained in Matthew and Luke. Its literary style seemed crude (its rough details are often smoothed off by Matthew and particularly Luke in their use of it). It evidently seemed to many Christians an inadequate, incomplete Gospel. It had no infancy stories at the begining and, perhaps, even then ended abruptly at what is now verse eight of the last chapter with no account of Jesus' appearances after his resurrection.[8]

In the personalities of Peter and Mark, Galilee and Jerusalem were represented, for Peter's home was in Galilee[9] and John Mark was the son of an influential, well to do family whose house in the earliest days was headquarters for a circle of Jerusalem Christians.[10] The Gospel presents the picture of Jesus which was current among the early Christians of Palestine and which is well summarized in the words attributed to Peter in the Book of Acts: "God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and with power, who went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed of the devil, for God was with him."[11]

This Gospel with its old Palestinian subject matter was compiled in Rome for the use of Italian Christians probably sometime in the decade 60 to 70. Exact dates are imposible.

The Gospel according to Matthew seems to have been compiled in a section of the church whose attitude toward the Law of Moses was quite different from that of the

[8] XVI:9-20, seems to be an ending added later.
[9] Mk. I:21, 29, III:16.
[10] Acts XII:12.
[11] Acts X:38.

Gentile Christians in Italy. Jesus is represented as teaching that not the slightest commandment of the Law of Moses should be neglected until everything shall have happened,[12] that is, apparently, until the end of the age when an entirely new order will begin.[13] Certain Christian preachers known to the compiler are evidently declaring that some commandments of the law are insignificant and need not be observed. He makes Jesus say that such careless preachers will be regarded as insignificant in the coming Kingdom of the Heavens: "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments and shall teach men so shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven." [14] Jesus' teaching about clean and unclean foods which the Christians about Rome under Mark's (and Peter's?) influence regarded as annulling the law of Moses, Matthew's Gospel, in using Mark, carefully restricts to a rebuke of scribal teaching about eating with unwashed hands. A parable is added which represents Jesus to have attacked only the tradition of the scribes.[15] Jesus is represented as saying that the teaching even of the reprobate scribes should be regarded with reverence in so far as they follow Moses.[16] Men ought to give a tenth of even the smallest garden herbs, mint, anise and cummin, as well as to be scrupulous about the weightier matters.[17] In the parable of the vineyard which is to be taken away from unworthy owners, the vineyard is not

[12] Mt. V:18.

[13] This may have been the position of Stephen, who apparently was loyal to Moses in the present age but thought that true religion in the new age would dispense with the temple and the temple ritual prescribed by Moses. Acts VI:14, VII:48-50.

[14] Mt. V:19.

[15] Mk. VII:19, Mt. XV:12-13, 20.

[16] Mt. XXIII: 2-3.

[17] Mt. XXIII:23.

merely represented, as in Mark, to be given to "others," which might mean Gentiles, but a sentence is added to the effect that "others" means *"a nation* bringing forth the fruits thereof," [18] that is, a reformed Jewish nation. In this nation the old twelve tribe divisions of the people will be re-established, and each apostle will be the ruling judge of a tribe: "In the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." [19] As the Christians look forward to the time when they will have to flee from Jerusalem, they are to pray that it may not be necessary to do so "on a Sabbath" [20] either because such a journey would break the Sabbath, or because of the difficulty of hiring workmen and animals on the Sabbath in preparation for the journey. To the great commission to make disciples of all nations is added the conservative clause, "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you," [21] which means obedience to all the details of the Mosaic law so thoroughly emphasized in the body of the Gospel. That is, Matthew's Gospel was compiled in a section of the church which believed that all Christians ought to keep the law of Moses. They did not go so far as to say, with the extremely conservative Christian Pharisees, that those who did not keep all the law of Moses could not be saved, for they allowed an obscure corner in the New Age for preachers who neglected some of the less important commandments.[22] But they felt that normal, hearty, first class Christians ought to keep all the law of Moses. It was men of this type who went from Jerusalem to

[18] Mk. XII:9; Mt. XXI:43
[19] Mt. XIX:28.
[20] Mt. XXIV:20.
[21] Mt. XXVIII:20.
[22] Acts XV:1, 5, Mt. V:19.

South Galatia in the fifties and tried to persuade Paul's converts there to become "first class" Christians.

At the same time this section of the church, so zealous for the Jewish law of Moses, was vigorously opposed to the Jewish leaders who had condemned Jesus and were doubtless now opposing the Christian movement. The Matthew Gospel exceeds the others in its denunciation of these men. Its various thrusts at them [23] culminate in the terrific polemic of chapter twenty-three. They and the Jerusalem mob which they have excited are pictured asking that the blood of Jesus may be upon them and their children.[24] They are represented to be a set of rascals who bribed the Roman soldiers to give a false account of what happened at the grave of Jesus, a lie still in circulation at the time when this Gospel was compiled.[25]

We have here then a Gospel produced in a circle of conservative Jewish Christians feeling two antagonisms. They were antagonistic to a type of liberal Christianity, whether Jewish or Gentile, somewhat like that represented by Paul, and also to orthodox, non-Christian Judaism. Both of these are treated with a vividness indicating their immediate presence and activity. One locality where such a situation existed in the Gospel-making period was Syrian Antioch. We know from Gal. II: 11-14 that a serious rupture of relationship occurred there between Peter and Paul over questions of social conduct involving the law of Moses. This rupture divided the Christians of the region and doubtless continued after Paul and Peter had left, perhaps with more intensity of feeling than had originally characterized the leaders themselves. In such

[23] *E.g.*, III:7-10, V:20, VI:1-18.
[24] XXVII:20-25.
[25] XXVIII:11-15.

a situation the special exaltation of Peter as an authoritative teacher, peculiar to this Gospel,[26] would be natural.

The narrowly Jewish presupposition characteristic of this Gospel, while distinct and unmistakable, appears only occasionally. The great body of the teaching of Jesus presented in it is concerned with other things than the relation of Christians to the Mosaic law. It is the precious treasure of the church, and of all those who earnestly seek religious experience.

The name of the apostle Matthew has been connected with this Gospel since the end of the second century. It has seemed to many modern scholars that an original apostle of Jesus, acquainted at first hand with the deeds and words of Jesus, would not have followed written documents so closely as the compiler of the Matthew Gospel has followed Mark and Q. A clue to another theory is found in a fragment from Papias, the Bishop of Hierapolis in Asia Minor already referred to, who says that "Matthew in the Hebrew (Aramaic?) dialect compiled the oracles (logia) and each one interpreted them as he was able." It has been natural to infer from this statement that the apostle Matthew was the compiler of the teaching of Jesus, that is, of that form of Q which constitutes (with modifications) so large a part of this Gospel and which has, therefore, given his name to the Gospel.[27]

The date of the Gospel may be soon after the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70. The coming of the Son of Man is expected to be very soon after that event:

[26] XVI:19, *cf.* XIV:28-29, XV:15, XVII:24, XVIII:21.

[27] Whether Papias himself interpreted in this way the tradition which had come down to him is another question. He may have understood that Matthew was the author of our Gospel which he called "logia" and yet the fact still be that the apostle Matthew had really been connected with an earlier stage of the Gospel's development.

"Immediately after the tribulation of those days . . . they shall see the Son of Man coming." [28] This expectation would hardly have been allowed to stand without some explanatory modification if any considerable time had passed without its fulfilment. The use of the baptismal formula, "into the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit," [29] is sometimes said to be evidence of a date later than the year 70, but this is not a necessary inference. A similar combination of names appears in Paul's writings fifteen years before the destruction of Jerusalem.[30]

The Gospel according to Luke is quite different in its spirit from either Mark or Matthew. It is entirely free from the Jewish exclusiveness which characterizes the Matthew Gospel. Its genealogy runs back to Adam instead of stopping with Abraham as the Matthew genealogy does. A Samaritan twice appears as an illustration of true religion.[31] God's favor to other foreigners is emphasized in Jesus' inaugural message with its reference to the widow of Sidon and Naaman the Syrian.[32] There is no such emphasis on the necessity of obeying all the details of the Mosaic law as appears in the Matthew Gospel.[33] There is a certain Greek beauty about the Gospel. Jesus' beautiful compassion for the poor and the outcast classes is emphasized and Jesus himself, "the Lord," moves about in a kind of golden haze, "glorified" and "welcomed" by those to whom he brings his beautiful mes-

[28] XXIV:29.
[29] XXVIII:19.
[30] II Cor. XIII:14.
[31] X:25-37, XVII:11-19; *cf.* Mt. X:5, "Go not into any way of the Gentiles and enter not into any city of the Samaritans."
[33] IV:26-27.
[32] The brief, somewhat ambiguous logion in Lk. XVI:17 may be the form of Q which is expanded in Mt. V:18-19.

sage.[34] In its use of the Mark Gospel verbal alterations are noticeable that make it presentable to Greek ears. It omits sections that were probably brought from Q into the Matthew Gospel but were too strongly Jewish in character and color to interest Greeks.[35] It lifts the narrative out of the narrow bounds of Palestine and connects it with world personages and events, Tiberius Cæsar and the Augustan census.[36]

Evidence regarding the location of the Greek clientage for which it was compiled is furnished by the Book of Acts, written later by the same author and dedicated to the same man, Theophilus. The hero of Acts is Paul and that book was apparently intended to circulate among churches either at the time personally acquainted with Paul or having a fresh tradition of his earlier connection with them. The Gospel therefore was probably also intended for circulation among Pauline churches in the provinces of Galatia, Asia, Macedonia, Achaia, perhaps also northern Syria and Cilicia. Paul conceived Jesus Christ as one who was crucified, went up to God in the heavens and from that point of vantage operated powerfully in the lives of those who received the heavenly Spirit of God. The compiler of the Luke Gospel adjusts his Gospel material to this scheme. Early in the Gospel Jesus starts for Jerusalem, the slaughter city of prophets,[37] in order that he may be received up into heaven: "And it came to pass when the days were well nigh come that he should be received up he steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem." [38] From this point on everything that follows is thought of as happening on the way

[34] IV:22, VIII:1, 40, XV, XXI:38.
[35] *E.g.*, Mt. V:22, 33-37, VI:1-7, 16-18, VII:6, XXIII:8-10, 16-22.
[36] II:1-2, III:1-2.
[37] XIII:33.
[38] IX:51.

to Jerusalem [39] and the Gospel ends with his ascension into heaven.[40] All through the Book of Acts, Jesus in heaven works upon his disciples on earth.[41]

While neither Gospel nor Acts mentions "Luke" tradition ascribes both books to him and identifies him with Paul's medical friend mentioned in the letter to the Colossians IV: 14. The place where the Gospel was compiled is uncertain. Luke was a traveler who probably collected his matter, oral and written, in various places. On the supposition that he was with Paul wherever the pronoun "we" occurs in the last half of Acts, he spent two years in Palestine in the late fifties,[42] and in this period would have had excellent opportunity for investigation and compilation. This might make the date of the Gospel to be very early (and the date of the Mark Gospel still earlier, since Luke used Mark). It is often thought that the date must be later, a considerable time after the destruction of Jerusalem, when it had become evident that the Coming of the Son of Man was not to be "immediately" after that event, as in Matthew, nor "in those days" as in Mark, but that Jerusalem must "be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." [43] However, this statement does not necessarily indicate a late date, for Paul in the fifties was writing about a Jewish apostacy to last until the times of the Gentiles should be fulfilled [44] and was thinking that all this might happen in his own lifetime. A date as late

[39] IX:57, X:1, 38, XVII:11.

[40] XXIV:51. Even if the clause "and was taken up into heaven" is not textually secure, Acts I:11 makes it certain that this is what the author meant by "parted from them."

[41] *E.g.*, II:33, III:16, IX:34, XVI:7, XVIII:9, XXIII:11.

[42] XXIV:27; *cf.* XXI:17, XXVII:1.

[43] Mt. XXIV:29, Mk. XIII:24, Lk. XXI:24.

[44] Rom. XI.

as the year 100 is possible and one as early as the late fifties or sixties not absolutely impossible.

The Gospel according to John is an entirely new type of Gospel. Its subject matter does not fit into the "synopsis" common to the first three Gospels. The scene of Jesus' activity is generally Judæa rather than Galilee. The first seventeen chapters present a series of discourses many of them attached to a narrative incident which serves as a text. The literary style of these discourses is entirely different from that used by Jesus in the other Gospels. This style characterizes the discourse with which the author himself introduces the Gospel and re-appears in the First Epistle of John. The subject matter of these discourses is quite different from that found in the other Gospels. Jesus talks about himself, his nature, the significance of his life in a somewhat theological way and generally in controversy with "the Jews," not the Scribes or Pharisees of the Synoptic Gospels. The Kingdom of God or the Heavens which is the frequent theme of Jesus in the other Gospels is mentioned here on only one occasion.[45] The structure of the sentences is Hebrew in its simplicity but the introductory sentences make it at once evident that the Gospel was produced for a Greek or Greco-Jewish thought world where the presentation of Jesus must be adjusted to the "Logos" idea: "In the beginning was the word (Logos)"; "the Logos became flesh and dwelt among us." [46]

The book is a semi-theological interpretation of the personality of Jesus put into the popular "Gospel" form. The "prophet John" in the Book of Revelation, written for Christians in the Province of Asia, did not hesitate to put on the lips of Jesus in heaven messages addressed

[45] III:3-5.
[46] I:1, 14.

directly to them.[47] So this author, writing as is generally believed to the same churches, may not have hesitated to put whole discourses on the lips of Jesus in Palestine.

The Gospel may have been long in the process of forming. Just as Paul probably preached the substance of the Letter to the Romans for many years and slowly wrought out certain ways of putting things which now appear in that letter, so the various discourses in this Gospel may have grown up separately and been finally combined into the present Gospel form. As in the case of the Synoptic Gospels, various preachers may have been concerned in this process. The question then would be whether the main witness endorsed by the sponsors at the end of the Gospel [48] could be an apostle.

In any case the interpretation of the personality of Jesus made in this Gospel is a revelation of the experience that men were having as they sought, like Paul, for direct spiritual acquaintance with Jesus glorified in the heavens. It is a challenge and guide to a certain type of sanely mystical Christian experience which always has been, and apparently always will be, very dear to the heart of the Christian church, though not in high degree the possession of all earnest souls.

[47] Rev. II, III.
[48] XXI:24.

CHAPTER III

RELIGION IN PALESTINE AS JESUS FOUND IT: BUILDINGS AND SECTS

THE religious life of a nation is a complex phenomenon, hard to describe even when it can be studied at first hand. What is the religious life of America or England? In presenting the religious life of a past age it is necessary to be cautious in at least two particulars. The surviving religious literature of the period may represent only one section of the life of the people; the most vital religion of the time, especially in a non-literary age, may not have expressed itself in literature at all. Furthermore such literature as has survived may present only the theory of religion, an inherited ideal that may not at all represent the real life of the people at the time.[1]

[1] The literature of Jesus' day available for the study of the religious conditions under which he grew up, includes first of all such information as the Gospels themselves contain, and next the writings of a Jew, Flavius Josephus, who was himself a product of the religious life of Palestine soon after the time of Jesus. He made his peace with the Romans before the end of the war in which they destroyed Jerusalem (70 A.D.) and lived in Rome for many years. Under the patronage of the Flavian Emperors (in whose honor he adopted his first name) he wrote a history of his people and a history of their last great war by which he hoped to lessen their unpopularity in the Greco-Roman world.

Little, if any, of the Jewish Talmud, or Teaching of the rabbis, was put into writing until perhaps the third century A.D. The great Rabbi Judah, who died about 219 A.D., was the leader in the

The religious life of the Jewish people found expression for itself in two types of buildings, the temple and the synagogue. There was but one temple, Jehovah's House, standing on a sacred historic elevation in the southeastern part of the walled city, Jerusalem. King Herod the Great, an Idumean half Jew maintained in office by Roman authority, who built much in many places, naturally wished to do his best in his own capital, and persuaded the Jewish religious authorities to let him rebuild their temple. The result, almost completed in Jesus' day, was a beautiful building made of white stone quarried under the city and trimmed with gold. "This temple appeared to strangers when they were at a distance like a mountain covered with snow, for as to those parts of it that were not gilt they were exceeding white." [2] The building was the pride of the Jew, the object that he longed to see wherever in the wide world he lived. In the extensive courts and colonnades about the temple itself Jews from all parts of the Roman Empire could be found, walking about with devout curiosity or standing in prayer. At certain times in the year hundreds of thousands of

work of compilation. The development of rabbinic teaching has continued through all the centuries. The earliest part of the Talmud contains material that can be used for a reconstruction of ideas that prevailed in Jesus' day.

In addition to these sources is a body of literature not found in our Bible, although produced between 200 B.C. and 100 A.D., much of it "apocalypse," or "revelation" of what is going on in the unseen world and of what will happen when the forces of the unseen world finally break into, and transform or displace, our present visible world. A brief clear account of each of these documents is found in *The Uncanonical Jewish Books* by W. J. Ferrar (1918), and a fuller account with text and commentary in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* by R. H. Charles, 2 vols. (1913). Separate editions of many of these writings are now appearing in an inexpensive form.

[2] Josephus, *War*, V:5:6.

pilgrims streamed into Palestine after extensive journeys by land and sea to offer sacrifice and prayer in the holy place. For years afterward there sounded in their ears in memory the tones of the silver trumpets summoning the multitudes to fall on their knees, the music of the male chorus and the temple band. They remembered glimpses of the rich fabric of the great curtain at the entrance of the temple swinging heavily in the draft of wind that came from the cool interior. An enthusiastic Jew, who lived perhaps in the time of the earlier temple, perhaps as late as Jesus' day, has left a description of it: "Its fabric owing to the draft of wind was in perpetual motion and as this motion was communicated from the bottom and the curtain bulged out to its highest extent, it afforded a pleasant spectacle from which a man could scarcely tear himself away." [3] The pilgrims remembered the skill with which the athletic ambidextrous priests were able to take the limbs of a calf and throw them so that they would land on exactly the right spot on the altar. They saw the large companies of the priests, sometimes more than 700 at once, leading up animals for sacrifice, working in relays, some of them sitting on benches awaiting their turn—like a baseball team—and everything proceeding with precision and in absolute silence.[4] They saw the High Priest,

"When he put on his glorious robes
And clothed himself in perfect splendor,
When he went up to the altar of Majesty
And made glorious the court of the sanctuary;
When he took the portions from the hand of his brethren
While standing by the blocks of wood.

[3] Letter of Aristeas.
[4] Letter of Aristeas.

"Then the sons of Aaron sounded with the trumpets of beaten work;
Yea they sounded and caused a mighty blast to be heard
For a remembrance before the most High.

"Then all flesh hasted together and fell upon their faces to the earth
To worship before the Most High
Before the Holy One of Israel.

"And the sound of the song was heard
And over the multitude they made sweet melody
And all the people of the land cried in prayer before the Merciful." [5]

The great men about the temple were the High Priests (that is, the officiating High Priest, ex-High Priests, and members of their families),[6] the Chief of the Temple Police ("the Captain of the Temple"), the lower priests, policemen, and the musicians.

It has been worth while to get this picture clearly before us, for at one time Jesus' enemies industriously circulated the rumor that he was an anarchist who proposed to destroy the sacred building, and in these temple courts he did the most daring deed of his whole career.

While the temple was theoretically the center of the Jewish religion, yet in Jesus' day it had ceased to be the real center of religious life. When in the year 70 A.D. the temple was destroyed and the sacrifices (which could be offered nowhere else) ceased, the religious life of the Jews went steadily on without serious interruption and has done so to the present day. The explanation of this phenomenon is found in another building, the synagogue, which because of what it represented was the real center

[5] Eccl. c.L.

[6] The High Priesthood under the Romans was no longer necessarily hereditary nor for life.

of outward Jewish religious life. As its name indicates it was a meeting house. In it religion was brought to the doors of almost all Jews the world over. It was to be found wherever there were Jews enough to build one. The synagogue service was primarily a Bible school, with rather ample and formal opening exercises, in which adults and children met together to study God's law. The law was taught here on the Sabbath and executed on week days. The building housed a Bible school on the Sabbath and a police court on week days: "In synagogues shall ye be beaten." [7]

The great man here—the man of supreme though unofficial influence—was the man who knew the law, the "Scribe." There was an executive head, "the Ruler of the Synagogue," but he did not in popular esteem rival the "Scribe," if the congregation happened to have one or more learned Scribes, any more than the modern Bible School Superintendent rivals a famous teacher, if the school happens to have one. Synagogue rulers might change but the famous teacher would hold his informal place of influence for life. The Ruler was responsible for selecting those to take part in the service, for maintaining good order,[8] and for general oversight of the building.

In the audience the most distinguished members occupied the front seats, the younger men behind and the men and women seated separately. The service was simple. Certain passages of scripture, Deut. VI: 4-9, XI: 13-21, Num. XV: 37-41, emphasizing the command of God to hear his law, were recited by the leader. Anyone appointed by the Ruler led in prayers and the audience responded with "Amen." There were two scripture read-

[7] Mk. XIII:9.
[8] *Cf.* Lk. XIII:14.

ings, one from the "Law," that is, the first five books of our Old Testament, a portion of which was definitely assigned to each Sabbath until the whole was read in the course of three years, and the other, perhaps not definitely assigned but selected by the reader, from the "Prophets." [9] These readings in Hebrew were in Palestine translated by the reader into Aramaic, a verse at a time in the case of the law, as many as three verses at a time in the case of the Prophets. Then followed the sermon, an exposition of the scripture, a "teaching" of the lesson, by any capable person whom the Ruler might secure, and the service closed with the benediction.

It has been worth while to get this picture clearly in mind for it was in the democratic synagogue service that Jesus found his chance: "Jesus went about in all Galilee teaching in their synagogues;" [10] and it was within the synagogue circle that antagonism to him began to develop.

Before leaving the subject of buildings one other may be noticed which had some indirect connection with the religious life. The Roman barracks were near the temple. The notes of the Roman bugle and the temple trumpet sometimes intermingled. The Romans had been in the land since 64 B.C. They usually interfered very little with local custom and religious practices. They were peculiarly considerate of the Jews, perhaps because of the indebtedness of Julius Cæsar to Jewish troops at a critical time in an Egyptian campaign.[11] The Romans did insist on appointing the High Priest and allowing him to hold office only during good behavior. They expected in this way to enlist the High Priest's family and followers on the Roman side and to keep the people in order

[9] *Cf.* Acts XIII:15.
[10] Mt. IV:23.
[11] Jos. *Ant.* XIV:8:1-3.

through them. The significance of this fact will be seen later in discussing Jesus' relation to the priests. Jesus' own attitude toward the Roman occupation became later a matter of general concern among the people.

In order further to understand the religious life in which Jesus grew up, it is necessary briefly to describe the different classes into which the nation was divided religiously.

First and most important of all were the *"Pharisees,"* the "Peruschim," "Separatists," or "Come-outers." This had perhaps originally been a nickname not chosen by themselves, like the name "Methodists" in modern church life. The Pharisees called themselves "Chaberim," "Comrades," "Brothers." They had an honorable ancestry. They were the spiritual descendants of the brave men and women who in the year 167 B.C. began opposition to the Syrian King Antiochus "Epiphanes" (the "Illustrious"; "Epimanes," the "crazy," his enemies preferred to call him). The King proposed to unify his empire by destroying all local or national religions. He desecrated the Jewish temple by sacrificing a pig, an animal obnoxious to the Jews, over their sacred altar. His officers went from house to house compelling men to offer pagan sacrifice at their doors or in the streets, to stop circumcising their children, and to burn their Bibles. He nearly succeeded in his endeavor for some of the Jewish priests sided with him, hoping for political and financial reward. The High Priest built a gymnasium near the temple enclosure, made the sons of high class families wear the broad brimmed Greek gymnasium hat and let the young priests neglect their temple sacrifices in order to spend their time in the gymnasium. A party was formed among the people to oppose this movement which was so near to success. They were at first called the

"Chasidim," "The Pious." Hundreds of them were put to death because they refused to become pagan. Their spiritual descendants were the "Pharisees," a name which appears first some decades later than the beginning of the movement. They were so called because they strenuously "separated" themselves from all foreign influence and consecrated themselves to the careful keeping of God's law. Later they separated themselves also from all of their own countrymen who did not scrupulously obey the law of God and who might presumably be ready to yield to foreign influences that were always pressing hard into the Jewish life of Palestine, and threatening to destroy true religion.

The Pharisees of Jesus' day stood for three fundamental ideas that have always appeared in religions of a high type: the existence of one only God, creator and provider; man a being of free will, but subject to God's predestination and responsible to him; life after death, with rewards and punishments dependent on conduct before death. They also believed in the existence of good and bad spirits and an unseen spiritual world. In Jesus' day they seem to have believed in the resurrection of the same body that died or the passage of the soul into another body.[12]

The beautiful side of Pharisaism in its earlier period appears in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in some of the synagogue prayers which may be as old as the time of Jesus. However, a very undesirable type of Pharisaism developed later, one which was bitterly antagonistic to Jesus. This type was produced by a perversion of what had originally been an excellence, namely, the emphasis laid on obedience to the law of Moses. Such

[12] Jos. *War* II:8:14, *Ant.* XVIII:1:3 *f.* Apocalypse of Baruch, XLIX:1-LI:16.

obedience constituted men "righteous." It became necessary, therefore, to study the law in all its details in order to see what it was that men must obey in order to be righteous. It was easy to think that obedience to each of these details added something to the sum total of righteousness which man was set to secure. Some requirements were recognized as greater than others and, therefore, as yielding larger credit than others. A man's final righteousness consisted in the excess of credits gained by obedience over debits incurred by disobedience. It was possible to ask a religious expert to specify some act of obedience that would yield enough credit to insure a favorable balance in the great day of reckoning and so give assurance of "salvation" beforehand. "What good thing shall I do to inherit eternal life?" a young man once asked Jesus. It was also easy to conclude that since a man might have a much larger credit in righteousness than he himself needed some of it could be transferred to those less fortunate. This practically, though not necessarily, reduced God to the status of a bookkeeper who, either directly himself or indirectly through expert angels, kept absolutely accurate accounts. It was impossible to feel any great warmth of affection for one who acts as a bookkeeper rather than a Father. In the case of those who took this view religion tended to become a hard mechanical matter of calculating commercialism that made the warm heart of love grow cold.

At another point the Pharisees' strenuous emphasis of law proved perilous. If a man must obey precise commandments in order to be righteous and have salvation he needs to ask exactly what action constitutes obedience to the commandments. The law commanded that the Sabbath day be kept holy, but in a hundred concrete cases that might be imagined just what action did obedience involve?

In order to meet the demand for information at this point a great body of explanations of the law had been developed and was constantly to be developed by generation after generation of scholarly scribes. This explanatory commentary on the law was handed down by one generation to the next as the authoritative "tradition of the elders." It came to be regarded as practically more important than the law itself, naturally, because it presented the law in the exact form in which it must be obeyed in order that men might accumulate righteousness and be saved. These minute applications of the law probably gave satisfaction to a certain type of mind. Some men loved the law and the more commandments there were the better they liked it. Others were made painfully nervous by the multitude of opportunities to go wrong and disobey through some inadvertence. In general the necessity of concentrating attention on a multitude of petty detailed actions exhausted a man's capacity for attention and left him little chance for expansion of mind in leisurely contemplation of large subjects and for deepening emotions in developing social friendships. It left him little chance to make character by deciding for himself whether an action was wrong or right and why. Men easily became so absorbed in "tithing mint, anise and cummin" that they had too little time and strength of attention left for "justice," or a generous sense of fair play, "mercy," and "faith" in God and man.[13] This was of course fatal to religious development, although originally intended to conserve it.

Furthermore, the determination to separate one's self strictly from all who did not keep the law, while in the original crisis a wholesome frame of mind, became in less acute situations very detrimental to a truly religious

[13] Mt. XXIII:23.

spirit. The resolve to shut one's self utterly up against any other human being is always the closing up of a possible opening into the larger life of enlarging social relations. When this hard unsocial front is presented to the other because he is "bad" and I am "good," a proud, illegitimate self-satisfaction results which ultimately degrades the one who allows himself to feel it. In the case of many Pharisees this disposition became still more evil because, in the course of time, to the natural pride of the individual Pharisee there was added class pride. There will be occasion to discuss this subject further when we study the fierce conflict that arose between Jesus and the more evil element among the Pharisees. This element most closely identified with the evil features of Pharisaism took quick offence at Jesus, stepped to the front to oppose him, and thereby became the most prominent representatives of Pharisaism in the Gospel narratives. Pharisees of the better type appear only here and there in the background.[14]

The *Sadducees* of Jesus' day were to a certain extent the spiritual descendants of those who in the great Syrian crisis a century and a half before had not been unwilling to become like the rest of the world religiously. In the earlier time some of the leading priests were of this mind, and in Jesus' day, too, the high priestly element was the dominant center of the sect.[15]

The Sadducees of Jesus' day would have resented the charge that they were irreligious. The lesson of the earlier struggle with all its brave martyrdoms had not been lost upon them. When Pompey's army captured Jerusalem in 64 B.C. and his soldiers were running through the temple courts cutting the throats of all they

[14] Mk. XII:28-34, Jn. III:1-2, VII:50.
[15] Acts V:17.

found there, the priests stood steadily at their altars.[16] The later Sadducees of Jesus' day would have described themselves as true conservatives in religion when compared with Pharisees. They did not believe in the existence of a spiritual world inhabited by angels and spirits, and would have justified their position by citing the more sacred and apparently older portions of the scriptures, the five books of the Law in which they found no such teaching. On the same ground also they rejected the idea of continued existence after death,[17] or at any rate the idea of a resurrection of the body.[18] They rejected the "tradition," accumulated by generations of scholarly Pharisaic scribes, and asserted allegiance to the unadulterated scriptures.[19] The dependence of their leaders on the Romans for retention in the high priestly office naturally led them to take keen interest in world politics and to wish that the nation might play some significant part in world relations. Most of the wealthy Jews were with them because the development of "big business" required the stable world conditions that the Romans maintained. The wealthy Jews also wished for closer commercial and social relationship with foreigners than Pharisaic exclusiveness tolerated. The average Pharisee and Sadducee of Jesus' day might be at least suggested by the modern ultra-conservative rabbi of the ghetto and the rich Jewish banker who still reverences his ancestral faith.

The *Essenes* were a picturesque sect that does not appear in the Gospel narrative and, therefore, needs no long discussion. They were farmer monks living on great

[16] Jos. *Ant.* XIV:4:3.
[17] Jos. *Ant.* XVIII:1:4, *War* II:8:14.
[18] Mk. XII:18.
[19] Jos. *Ant.* XIII:10:6.

farms west of the Dead Sea, though they had order houses in some Palestinian cities. They were celibates (with the exception of one section); had common property; were obedient to their official superiors; ate in silence at common tables; bathed frequently and used no oil; wore white garments never discarded until worn out; had secret doctrines and books containing the names of angels; took no oath but were absolutely truthful and famous for kindliness; kept the seventh day Sabbath; worshipped Jehovah and sent offerings to the temple, but seem not to have sacrificed in the regular way (according to Philo they sacrificed no animals) and so to have been excluded from the temple court; felt reverence for the sunlight; held a Greek view of immortality which did not involve the resurrection of the body.[20]

Josephus ranks with the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes, what he calls "a fourth philosophic sect." It came into existence in Judæa during the boyhood of Jesus, spread like an infection through the nation, especially among the young men, and led finally, as Josephus thought, to the capture of Jerusalem and the destruction of the temple by the Romans in 70 A.D. It was a protest against Roman taxation. Judas the Galilean and his associate Saddouk the Pharisee "both said this taxation was nothing better than an introduction to slavery, and exhorted the nation to assert their liberty." The movement had a distinctly religious side: "They also said that God would not otherwise be assisting to them than upon their joining with one another in such counsels as might be successful and for their advantage." [21] Jesus may have been in contact with the revolutionary movement dur-

[20] Jos. *Ant.* XVIII:1:5, *War* II:8. Philo *On The Virtuous Man Being Free,* XII. Pliny *Nat. Hist.* V:17.
[21] Jos. *Ant.* XVIII:1:1.

ing his boyhood and business life in Nazareth, and must have had to reckon with it later in public teaching.

The *average citizen* is a term that would probably include the large majority of the nation in any religious classification. According to Josephus there were only about 6,000 Pharisees and still fewer Sadducees. The body of the nation naturally looked to the scholarly scribes for religious leadership and the scribes were generally Pharisees. A man of any sect might become an expert student of the law and so be a scribe, but since the Pharisees were most devoted to the law most of the scribes were of their party. The dominance of the Pharisaic influence over the people was due not only to the fact that the Pharisees stood for the great fundamental truths of religion which appeal powerfully to the hearts of those who are religiously inclined, but also to the fact that they and their scribes seem generally to have been in possession of the synagogues and so to have had the equipment requisite for a vigorous propaganda. The people did the best they could to keep the law as the scribes taught them to and were sorry that they so often failed. Sometimes the character of the scribe was such as to make them suspect that he did not always incur the inconvenience of living up to his own strict teaching. Then people went home from the synagogue service grumbling that the scribes "bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne and lay them on men's shoulders but they themselves will not move them with their finger." [22]

There were also *irreligious Jews,* so-called "sinners," no better than "sinners of the Gentiles," [23] who fell away from the synagogue service and made no effort to keep the law of Moses. These "sinners" were regarded as were

[22] Mt. XXIII:4.
[23] Gal. II:15.

men and women in an old colonial New England town who never went to church. They were, however, not so isolated as the non-church going colonialist for on every side of them were *foreigners* in comparatively large numbers. Some Palestinian cities were more thoroughly Jewish than others, but everywhere Greek life pressed in upon Jewish life. There were fine business openings for shrewd Jews who would do business with foreigners. There were lucrative offices to hold in collecting taxes. The Jewish tax collectors were specially offensive to the scribes because their business required them to have such intimate, defiling contact with foreigners whose goods they inspected, on holy Sabbath days as well as on other days, to say nothing of general Jewish scorn for a fellow countryman who would help collect the unholy tax imposed by a foreign government on God's people. So "publicans" were classed with sinners and harlots.

Through these irreligious Jewish and foreign strata of society there must have flowed streams of influence everywhere current in the eastern world. Religious ideas and superstitions of many sorts from many countries would be talked of on roads and in markets by itinerant merchants, travelers, soldiers, slaves. These do not appear distinctly in the Gospels but Jesus must have found them as he moved about in close contact with "publicans and sinners."

CHAPTER IV

RELIGION IN PALESTINE AS JESUS FOUND IT (*Concluded*):

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE MESSIANIC HOPE

ONE feature of the religious situation, more or less affecting all sects and classes, needs consideration by itself: the Kingdom of God and the Messianic expectation. The Jews, because of their geographical location, midway between the East and the West, had always been in touch with great world empires, Babylon, Egypt, Persia, Greece, Syria, Rome. Though they were a small nation they were compelled to think in world terms. Their sense of being the chosen people of Jehovah, the One God of all the earth, resulted in a colossal ambition. The strongly religious element in the nation believed that Jehovah would finally set up a world empire of his own on a grand scale in which, of course, he would make his own people the dominant world power. The phrase "Kingdom of God," or "Kingdom of the Heavens" does not appear frequently in literature before the Christian period, although the idea is frequent enough. In the Gospels the phrase is used as one by that time familiar to everyone and needing no explanation.

There were various opinions as to the process by which the Empire of God would be established. It might be by

military force. If so, since Jewish armies were necessarily small the direct re-enforcement of God would be required. This had not been lacking in the past. God had given help to resolute little bands of Jewish soldiers, facing great odds, when the Syrian king had tried to destroy Jehovah's religion. He had sometimes destroyed huge alien armies by pestilence, or by putting strange terror into their hearts, or by leading them into the sea and drowning them. Jewish history gave plenty of encouragement to military revolutionists. Some of the synagogue teachers were often reminding their audiences of these inspiring facts. On the other hand it was easy to feel that God himself, unaided by men, might blaze out from heaven with destructive glory and consume the enemies of his people. There were some who pictured a peaceful missionary propaganda that would convert the nations of the earth to Jehovah's ways.[1] But the Jews had suffered much at the hands of the nations and it would have seemed only right to most of them that their sufferings should be avenged by their God.

In connection with this idea of the Kingdom of God there had also developed the expectation of a "Messiah." The word means "Anointed" and was translated into Greek as "Christos." Men were set apart as prophets or priests or kings, by being "anointed" with oil. The king especially was "God's Anointed." It was natural to think of the Great King in the Kingdom of God as "The Anointed," "The Messiah," "The Christos." It was, however, entirely possible to separate the idea of the Kingdom of God from Messiahship. There were those in Jesus' day who thought that God would himself be the king and would anoint no one to rule for him. They probably pointed out the fact that God had originally objected to

[1] Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.

having a king over his people.[2] But the idea of a king was a favorite one. God had given them great kings in the past, notably David, "a man after his own heart." There were kings on every side and an emperor at Rome.

The current ideas were vague at many points. If there was to be a Messianic king, where would the king come from? And when? How long would he reign? What sort of rule would he enforce? What would he do with foreigners? What would be his relation to God? What would be the relation of the earth and its inhabitants to all the angel inhabitants of the seven heavens that arched above the earth? Would the righteous dead have any part in the Kingdom? And what would become of the wicked, living and dead? There was ample chance for speculation to run riot. Regarding certain points, however, opinion was not entirely chaotic.

There were two general types of expectation among those who looked for a Messiah: the "Son of David" and the "Son of Man" type.[3] The David dynasty had seemed to end centuries before but it was felt that God did not intend the dynasty to become extinct. There were still obscure families here and there that traced their lineage back to David. Some one among them, who had inherited the ancient warrior king's military genius and devotion to Jehovah, might be raised up by God to be the leader of his people. This expectation in its best form appears in "The Psalms of Solomon," David's son, sometimes called "The Psalms of the Pharisees," a collection of eighteen Psalms produced some fifty years before the birth of

[2] I Sam. VIII:4-22.

[3] It is perhaps a question how widely the "Son of Man" type was known among the people. It was held in apocalyptic circles but it may well have been known beyond the circles that held it. For the contrary view see Strack and Billerbeck, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus Erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch*, p. 486.

Jesus. The Psalmist recognizes that God is king over all forever and that his kingdom is everlasting, but that he had chosen David as under-king and promised that his dynasty should not fail. Now the Psalmist prays that God will raise up for the people "their king, the Son of David." He will free his people from foreign control, make Jerusalem the capital of his kingdom and bring back the twelve tribes from all over the earth.

"And he shall gather together a holy people whom he shall lead in righteousness,
And he shall judge the tribes of the people that has been sanctified by the Lord his God.
And he shall not suffer unrighteousness to lodge any more in their midst,
Nor shall there dwell with them any man that knoweth wickedness,
For he shall know them that they are all sons of their God."

"And he himself will be pure from sin so that he may rule a great people.
He will rebuke rulers and remove sinners by the might of his word;
And relying upon God throughout his days he will not stumble;
For God will make him mighty by means of his Holy Spirit,
And wise by means of the spirit of understanding with strength and righteousness." [4]

The "Son of Man" idea had a different origin. In chapters XXXVII-LXXI of the "Book of Enoch," to be dated the first century B.C., about the time of the Psalms of Solomon, Enoch, who is being conducted through the heavens,[5] learns of an exalted heavenly being called "Son of Man." Back of this usage there may be some ancient idea of "The Man in Heaven" above all angels and next to God. Whatever may be the lineage of the idea, in the

[4] XVII:28-30, 41-43.
[5] XLVI:2.

Book of Enoch that Heavenly Man, or "Son of Man," who had been with God always is called "the Anointed," and is chosen by God to break in upon the earth and perform functions commonly regarded as Messianic: overthrow all oppressors in a great world judgment and on a transformed earth bring peace to men forever more.

"And this Son of Man whom thou hast seen
Shall put down the kings and the mighty from their seats,
And the strong from their thrones,
And shall loosen the reins of the strong,
And break the teeth of the sinners.
And he shall put down the kings from their thrones and kingdoms
Because they do not extol and praise him,
Nor humbly acknowledge whence the Kingdom was bestowed upon them."[6]

"For that Son of Man has appeared,
And has seated himself on the throne of his glory,
And all evil shall pass away before his face."[7]

"He shall be a staff to the righteous whereon to stay themselves and not fall,
And he shall be the light to the Gentiles,
And the hope of those who are troubled of heart."[8]

"And the righteous and elect shall be saved on that day,
And they shall never thenceforward see the face of the sinners and unrighteous.
And the Lord of spirits shall abide over them,
And with that Son of Man shall they eat
And lie down and rise up forever and ever."[9]

The author of this section of the Book of Enoch shows in at least one place that he is not unmindful of a passage

[6] XLVI:4-6.
[7] LXIX:29.
[8] XLVIII:4.
[9] LXII:13-14.

in the prophecy of Daniel.[10] In chapter VII of Daniel four world empires are symbolized by four beasts that come up out of the sea. Then the God of heaven introduces his empire, symbolized not by a brute form but by a human form, "one like unto a son of man," coming not out of the destructive sea, but on clouds from heaven. It was perhaps theoretically possible to conceive of the Son of Man as embodying himself in a Son of David.

In chapter XIII of IV Esdras (before 70 A.D.) "the man out of the sea" flies on the clouds, defeats the nations assembled against him on Mount Zion and performs an apparently Messianic judgment.

Another Messianic title, "Son of God," fitted into either the "Son of David" or the "Son of Man" type. The nation was thought of as God's Son,[11] and especially the King,[12] so that the "Son of David" would be the "Son of God." The inhabitants of heaven were "sons of God;" it is said of the righteous dead after the resurrection that "they are equal unto the angels and are sons of God being sons of the resurrection." [13] Especially is this title applied to superior angels like the sons of God who in the prologue to the Book of Job appeared before God. So the heavenly "Son of Man" would naturally be called the "Son of God." It is also true that a good man was called a "son of God." [14] In the later development of Christian experience and theology it was the title "Son of God" that was utilized as suggestive of the deeper meaning recognized by Christians in the Messiahship of Jesus.

There were various ideas regarding the length of the Messiah's reign in the Kingdom of God. There are

[10] XLVI-XLVIII.
[11] Ex. IV:22-23, Hos. XI:1, Ps. of Solomon XVIII:4.
[12] II Sam. VII:14, Ps. LXXXIX:26-27.
[13] Lk. XX:36.
[14] Wisdom of Solomon II:16, 18, Ecclesiasticus XXIII:1.

traces of the opinion that it would endure for a thousand years, a "millennium." In IV Esdras, a Jewish writing near the end of the first century A.D., the Messiah reigns 400 years, dies a peaceful death together with "all in whom there is human breath." Then, after seven days of silence like that which prevailed before the present age began, will occur the resurrection and the New Age, "the Age which is not yet awake." [15] According to another view the Messiah judges men and the Kingdom of God follows the judgment and endures for an indefinite time.[16]

There were two views among the Palestinian Jews regarding the fate of foreigners when God's New Age should dawn on the world. The most lenient view in the literature produced near the time of Jesus is found in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs about 100 B.C.

"The Lord shall visit all the Gentiles in his tender mercies forever." [17]

"The twelve tribes shall be gathered together there (at the temple), and all the Gentiles, until the Most High shall send forth his salvation." [18]

"He shall save Israel and all the Gentiles." [19]

But about the same time another element in the nation expresses a very different disposition: "And all the idols of the heathen will be abandoned: the temples will be burned with fire and they will be removed from the whole earth and they will be cast into the judgment of fire and will perish in wrath and in grievous eternal judgment." [20]

[15] IV Esdras VII:26-44.
[16] I Cor. XV:25-28.
[17] Levi. IV:4.
[18] Benj. IX:2.
[19] Asher VII:3.
[20] Enoch XCI:9.

A book produced in the time of Jesus' boyhood pictures the Jews on high looking with gratitude down into Gehenna upon the sufferings of their enemies.[21] Some who felt that God's compassion would include foreigners, still felt that they would never rank up with Jews in his sight:

"They shall have no honor through the name of the Lord of Spirits,
Yet through his name shall they be saved,
And the Lord of Spirits will have compassion on them,
For his compassion is great." [22]

Among those who anticipated salvation for foreigners in the Kingdom of God, there were different views as to the terms on which they would be let in. Most of the evidence for lenient terms is found in Jewish communities outside Palestine. The Sibylline Oracles [23] specify as conditions to be met by proselytes, who would presumably thereafter be regarded as eligible for future admission into the Kingdom of God, grace before meals, keeping away from pagan temples, no murder, no dishonesty in business, no sexual immorality, and baptism. The Book of Acts speaks repeatedly of "devout Greeks," or "God-fearers," in synagogue audiences outside of Palestine. They were evidently persons who did not become Jewish proselytes but worshiped Jehovah. They probably ate no pork, observed the Sabbath as well as they conveniently could, and kept away from the worship and women of pagan temples. Conservative Jews in the audience would have looked askance at them, while the liberal Jews were more cordial. All appreciated the money they often

[21] Assumption of Moses X:10.
[22] Enoch L:3.
[23] Book IV, lines 24-33, 162-170.

brought to the synagogue treasury.[24] We know of one synagogue in Palestine where such persons were present. In this case, the synagogue building was the gift of one of them.[25] Perhaps there would have been many such mixed audiences if Greek had been the language of the Palestinian synagogue as it was among the Jews of foreign countries. There were doubtless both liberal and conservative views as to what chance such people would have to find a place in the coming Kingdom of God. The most conspicuous case of the liberal viewpoint in early Christian literature is the grandmother of a famous assistant of the Apostle Paul, Timothy of South Galatia. This woman let her daughter marry a Greek, presumably an uncircumcised attendant of the synagogue. The son born of this marriage was faithfully instructed in the Jewish scriptures by his pious mother and grandmother but they allowed him to grow up without the Jewish rite of circumcision. This they would not have done if they had supposed that they were shutting the boy out of the Kingdom of God. In Palestine such conduct would probably have seemed scandalous and there were evidently plenty of conservatives to criticize it in the region where it happened.[26]

Enough has been said to show that there was a wide range of divergent opinion among religious people regarding the coming Kingdom of God. It was to be a time when ideals would be realized, and ideals varied. Modern Christians look forward to "heaven" with very vague ideas

[24] *E.g.*, Acts X:1-2.

[25] Lk. VII:2-5.

[26] II Tim. III:15, Acts XVI:1-3. *Cf.* also the case of King Izates whom the Jewish merchant-preacher, Ananias, converted to Judaism without having him circumcised, but who was later persuaded to circumcision by the stricter Pharisaic Jew, Eleazar. Jos. *Ant.* XX:2:3-4.

of what it will be like, but sure that it will bring the realization of their ideals. The Pharisee looked forward to the Kingdom as a situation in which all the people would keep the law of Moses as the scribe interpreted it. A Messiah was not essential to the realization of this ideal. The scribes were equal to the task if God would only touch the hearts of the people. Those who did expect a Messiah regarded him as one who would maintain a situation in which the scribe could do his work effectively. The Sadducees, priests and men of big business, were well satisfied with the present situation. They had no desire to see the narrow minded rabbis have their way. A Messiah who sided with the rabbis could ruin business. To encourage the Messianic idea meant the overthrow of Rome, and Rome was the source of all their prosperity. The great body of the people who longed for the Kingdom wanted it to bring them a better living, more food and clothing and leisure, together with social recognition and political pre-eminence everywhere.

More or less common to all classes of society who possessed the expectation at all were these three ideas: the triumph of righteousness, that is, the doing of Jehovah's will as expressed in his holy law and the consequent enjoyment of great peace and prosperity; the political supremacy of the Jews in all the earth—either the earth as it is or a transformed earth—though other nations if submissive might have some share in their prosperity; the realization of this result through the activity of God's under-king, the Messiah, whose judgment would banish evil men from the earth.

It was in the public life of this turbulent Jewish world with its vague and diverse ideals that Jesus, when about thirty years of age, for some reason felt constrained to find his place and make his way. His attempt lasted only

a short time, perhaps two years and a half, and resulted in an execution by crucifixion followed almost immediately by a wonderful outburst of prophetic enthusiasm among his disciples. In this short time he wrought out something which has held the attention of men ever since, something the full meaning of which is not yet clear. He started new life in the world. His personality marks the boundary between things new and old. By an increasing number of the human race all events in history are reckoned as occurring Before or After Christ.

CHAPTER V

JESUS IN PRIVATE LIFE

AS has just been said, Jesus lived almost all of his life as a private citizen. Only for a little while near the end did he become a public character.[1] When he appeared as a public teacher he had a mature character and a well established general viewpoint, which must have been developed during the years of his private life. He must have passed through a profound religious experience during this period and thought deeply on the subjects he discussed in his public teaching. This does not mean that the great crises through which Jesus so rapidly passed in the course of his brief public career contributed nothing to the deepening of his religious experience and the further development of his character. It was the conviction of the early Christian leaders that Jesus "learned obedience through the things that he suffered" and that only in this way did he become "unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation." [2]

[1] The length of Jesus' public career is uncertain. The Fourth Gospel mentions three Passovers (II:13, VI:4, XVIII:28) and possibly a fourth (V:1). According to the Fourth Gospel, therefore, Jesus' public career lasted either a little more than two or a little more than three years. In the Synoptic Gospels only one Passover is mentioned in the account of his public life, namely, that at the time of which he was crucified. However they narrate more than could easily have happened in a fraction of a year or even in a whole year.

[2] Heb. V:8-9.

When they used this language they evidently had in mind his public career and especially his experience in facing death and all that led up to his execution. But it is still true that the long years of private life in Nazareth must have been profoundly significant. What a man does in an emergency is largely determined by what he has been doing for years before. If Abraham Lincoln during his years of private life had not been always brooding over the great problems of national life and fixing upon the main lines along which their solution was to be sought, he could not have been the kind of President he later became. At the same time his later experience as a public man contributed much to his development.

We know very little about the details of Jesus' life before he became a public character. The early disciples by whom our Christian Gospels were shaped either were unable to learn much about these details or, more probably, had little interest in them. Jesus' life had been so commonplace and even poor in its material circumstances that the portrayal of it would have hindered rather than helped in the presentation of him to the Greco-Roman world as the majestic Messiah of God, the Lord of heaven and earth soon to return to the earth in heavenly power. The Gospels give information at only two points, both of which contribute to this main purpose: the Matthew and Luke Gospels speak of his birth and Luke describes a scene in his boyhood. The wonderful life that Jesus' disciples found themselves living in the decades immediately following his death was attributed by them to inspiration poured into their souls by Jesus glorified in heaven.[3] In certain circles this wonderful life seemed logically explained by the theory that Jesus, the source

[3] Acts II:33.

of it, had been born as the result of the direct and exclusive action of God upon his mother. Such a theory was not uncommon in the Greco-Roman world as an explanation of remarkable men, nor was it inconsistent with Jewish thought. This conviction was not confined to one section of the church, for the two forms of it in Matthew and Luke are so different that they are not likely to have prevailed in the same region, or at least in the same circles.[4]

The data afforded by the early chapters of these Gospels place the birth of Jesus sometime between the year 8 B.C., the possible date of a Roman census decree which may have required considerable time for its execution, and the death of Herod the Great in the year 4 B.C. The year 5 or 6 B.C. is a probable date.[5]

Both Gospels represent the birth to have been in Bethlehem of Judæa. In Luke's Gospel the birth story is preceded by beautiful hymns ascribed to the mother of Jesus and the father of John the Baptist. With devout poetic imagination the sky on the birth night is peopled with a chorus host of angels who proclaim peace on earth to all men of good will (or men who please God), while an angel messenger announces the birth of "a Savior who is Christ a Lord," or "an Anointed Lord." With an ap-

[4] The theory of miraculous birth seems not to have been used in ordinary preaching. The missionary sermons reported in the Book of Acts contain no allusion to it, nor do the letters of Paul. The Fourth Gospel, which has as its avowed purpose the proving "that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God," does not include the miraculous birth in its proof. The author evidently did not regard it as an essential part of the proof, else he would not have omitted it. He may have believed it (a possible variant reading of I:13 indicates that he did), but he did not press its acceptance upon others as essential to their belief in "Jesus Christ the Son of God."

[5] Lk. II:1; Mt. II:1. Ramsay, *Was Christ Born in Bethlehem*, Chs. VIII, IX.

preciative emphasis of the poor and lowly, characteristic of Luke's Gospel, the announcement is made to shepherds in the fields. They are first to greet the new-born babe lying in a manger in the lower story of the khan, where animals were kept, the upper story (or perhaps a nearby building) being already fully occupied by travellers who had come to Bethlehem for the census enrollment. A few days later in the neighboring city of Jerusalem the parents make the offering at the temple prescribed for people of meagre means in the case of a first born child. Here an aged man and woman recognize the child as destined to be connected in some wonderful way with the long expected exaltation of the Jewish people to a position of world supremacy.

The Matthew Gospel reports a visit to Jerusalem made by magians from the interior of Asia, students of the stars who had found in the heavens a sign of the birth of a great Jewish king. (During the years 6-8 B.C. there are known to have been notable conjunctions of planets.) They learned from Jewish scholars in Jerusalem that the sacred scriptures predicted such a birth in Bethlehem. A miraculous light led them to the exact spot in Bethlehem where the infant Jesus lay and they laid royal gifts before him. They were warned by God in a dream to go directly home without letting the Great Herod know where his infant rival was to be found. The parents of Jesus were also warned by God in a dream to flee to Egypt with their infant child in order to escape from the evil suspicions of Herod. Herod to make sure of destroying this new-born rival of himself and his heirs, killed all the boy babies in Bethlehem under two years of age. It is not in place here to consider how much of these narratives is the product of the devout imagination of those who later found in Jesus a Lord and Savior

lifted into the heavens and given power to control the destinies of mankind.

Both Gospels give genealogies tracing the lineage of Jesus through David to Abraham (Lk. on to Adam "who was the son of God"). The lines of descent between Jesus and David are quite different in the two Gospels. These differences were much discussed by Christians of the second and third centuries. Julius Africanus accounted for them on the supposition that they resulted from the levirate law by which a man married his brother's childless widow and counted the first born son as belonging to his brother. One genealogy was supposed to give the actual father in a given case and the other the legal father.[6] It is also said that the Matthew genealogy gives the line of royal succession from David to Jesus, which was not always from father to son, while Luke gives the actual descent from father to son. It is furthermore sometimes said that Matthew gives Joseph's lineage while Luke gives that of Mary the mother of Jesus. There seem to be no data for an entirely satisfactory explanation of the differences.

Luke's Gospel contains an incident out of the boyhood of Jesus in which his early and intense interest in the discussion of religious truth appears. When he went up at the age of twelve years to the Passover festival in Jerusalem he could not tear himself away from the beautiful temple. He stayed behind in Jerusalem, after his parents started for their home in Galilee, probably hoping to follow later in company with other Nazareth friends. His parents turned back to search for him and found him in the temple colonnades listening to the discussions of the famous Jerusalem rabbis, asking them questions and giving remarkably thoughtful replies to their questions. An oriental boy of twelve is more mature than a modern

[6] Eusebius, *Ch. Hist.* 1:6.

boy but Jesus seemed to the scribes wise beyond his years. The point emphasised by Luke is that he had a deeply satisfying sense of being where he belonged. When his parents told him that they had been looking through the city for him, he wondered that they should have looked anywhere else than at the temple. The sense of belonging to God his heavenly Father and belonging in the House of God was warm and strong within him.[7]

Explicit information about Jesus' private life ends here. The most that can be further learned regarding it has to be inferred from hints in the Gospels and from general knowledge of life in Palestine. We know that he lived in Nazareth,[8] a town of Galilee, situated near some of the great roads that connected the farther East with the Mediterranean and Egypt. Within sight from the hill tops about Nazareth all the varied traffic of these roads could have been seen in the distance. Places made famous by the heroes of Jewish history were also within the range of vision. The historic associations that were fixed upon the minds of the Nazareth boys by their parents and their teachers were in influence like those of a Massachusetts boy who lives near Bunker Hill, Lexington and Concord or a Virginian who lives near historic sites of Old Dominion days and the period of the Civil War.[9]

[7] Lk. II:41-51.

[8] Lk. II:39, 51, Mk. I:9.

[9] "The position of Nazareth is familiar to all. The village lies on the most southern of the ranges of Lower Galilee, and on the edge of this just above the Plain of Esdraelon. You cannot see from Nazareth the surrounding country, for Nazareth rests in a basin among hills; but the moment you climb to the edge of this basin, which is everywhere within the limit of the village boys' playground, what a view you have! Esdraelon lies before you, with its twenty battle-fields—the scenes of Barak's and of Gideon's victories, the scenes of Saul's and Josiah's defeats, the scenes of the struggles for freedom in the glorious days of the Maccabees. There is Naboth's

Jesus had in Nazareth the experience of home life which is so fundamental in the development of character. He was the oldest son in a rather large family of children. They with their mother Mary were all living in Nazareth when Jesus returned later as a public teacher. The names of his four brothers were James, Joses, Simon and Judas. There was also a group of sisters who had probably married Nazareth men. "His sisters are they not all with us," the Nazareth neighbors said.[10] They were such very ordinary people that the neighbors found it difficult to think of Jesus as the extraordinary man he seemed to have become since leaving home. Since his father is not mentioned in this connection he must have been dead. If he had been long dead responsibility for the support of some at least of the younger brothers and sisters had for a time rested largely upon Jesus as the oldest and unmarried son. He knew from experience the

vineyard and the place of Jehu's revenge upon Jezebel; there Carmel and the place of Elijah's sacrifice. To the east the Valley of Jordan, with the long range of Gilead; to the west the radiance of the Great Sea, with the ships of Tarshish and the promise of the Isles. You see thirty miles in three directions. It is a map of Old Testament history.

"But equally full and rich was the present life on which the eyes of the boy Jesus looked out. Across Esdraelon, opposite to Nazareth, there emerged from the Samarian hills the road from Jerusalem, thronged annually with pilgrims, and the road from Egypt with its merchants going up and down. The Midianite caravans could be watched for miles coming up from the fords of Jordan; and, as we have seen, the caravans from Damascus wound round the foot of the hill on which Nazareth stands. Or if the village boys climbed the northern edge of their hollow home, there was another road within sight, where the companies were still more brilliant—the highway between Acre and the Decapolis, along which legions marched, and princes swept with their retinues, and all sorts of travellers from all countries went to and fro."

G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, pp. 432 *f.*

[10] Mt. XIII:55-56.

anxieties of the poor regarding which he spoke with such effect later in his public teaching. He and his mother may often have said: "What shall we eat? What shall we drink? Wherewithal shall we be clothed?" He had learned from deep experience, perhaps in wakeful hours at night, that the heavenly Father knows our need of all these things and that those who mean to do right, who resolutely "seek first the Kingdom of God and its righteousness," may trust him to give them a chance to earn what they need.[11] There is indication that family life did not always run smoothly. There were family "jars" especially after the younger brothers married and brought their young wives home to live with their mother-in-law. Jesus' own conscientious convictions, implied in "seeking first the Kingdom of God and its righteousness" may have led him to do some things in business that seemed queer and unpractical. It will appear that his family later thought him temporarily to have lost his mental balance, and that his brothers later did not esteem him as his disciples did.[12] The peculiar phrasing of one of his teachings is perhaps evidence that he was sometimes a divisive element especially between the other children and their parents: "I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother and the daughter in law against her mother in law." [13]

Jesus had also the discipline of business life as a character forming influence in Nazareth. He is called "the carpenter" and "the carpenter's son." [14] As a carpenter

[11] Mt. VI:31-33.

[12] Mk. III:21, 31-35, Jn. VII:5.

[13] Mt. X:35. The primary reference of this utterance would be to what happened later when there was conflict between Jesus' disciples and their relations, or between the church and the synagogue. *Cf.* Micah VII:6.

[14] Mk. VI:3, Mt. XIII:55.

he would have made the simple furniture of the houses. Justyn Martyr, himself a native of Palestine, said that Jesus made yokes and plows.[15] If the word carpenter can be extended to include the building of houses, either as workman or contractor, he would have needed to be a stone mason also, for then as now the houses were probably not made chiefly of wood. In business he would have become familiar with the petty side of human nature. He would have had delinquent debtors to dun, over critical customers to satisfy, fair bargains to drive with shrewd over-reaching business men skilled in the tedious process of oriental bargaining. What he had to say later about the damaging effect of riches on character may have been learned by repeated observation in business life. He doubtless knew what it was to have a year or a month when he ran behind. He may also have known how it felt to begin to accumulate and get ahead. He may have felt the inclination to lay up treasure on earth at any cost and fought it down. If he was an employer of labor he knew what it was to put up with slackers. He may have sometimes visited the markets at intervals all through the day looking for men who, he knew, would be hard up and in need of employment. Perhaps he sometimes paid them at the end of the day in a queer way according to their needs and not their exact earnings![16] Perhaps, too, he himself at some stage of his career had stood until the eleventh hour waiting for a chance to earn what the family needed that day.

Jesus experienced the upbuilding influence of close social contact with friends and neighbors. He helped them celebrate weddings. He knew how a wedding week ought to be celebrated and may himself many times have

[15] Dialogue c. LXXXVIII.
[16] Mt. XX:1-16.

been one of the "sons of the bridegroom" who helped to make the wedding feast a social success.[17] He later described himself as one who "came eating and drinking" and recognized the slanderous exaggeration of his social habits.[18] He mourned with his neighbors at their funerals and comforted them, always remembering the day when his own large family group had walked wailing behind the bier of the dead father and had come home to take up new burdens.

He talked with friends and neighbors about the politics of the country, the burden of heavy taxes, the revolutionary movement of Judas and Saddouk (p. 35). He heard the pros and cons of joining it discussed in his shop and about the synagogue door in the evening.

He sat with friends and neighbors in the synagogue service. As a boy he grew restive under the teaching of tedious scribes and made up his mind how he would teach if he ever got the chance. The great vital themes that stirred his mind as a boy among the Jerusalem scribes at the temple were burning in his heart for years. As a child at home, and in the synagogue school he had been taught the scriptures. He heard them read each Sabbath in the synagogue. He probably had some scripture rolls himself and had learned to read the Hebrew text.[19] Could he read them in Greek?

In all these elemental relations—with home, with friends, with work—which God has ordained as the means of making character Jesus grew. Plain daily life is a situation devised by God for teaching men how to love and use power, and in such a situation the character of Jesus was developed. In such a situation he was find-

[17] Mk. II:19.
[18] Mt. XI:19.
[19] Lk. IV:16-20, *cf.* I Mac. I:56-57.

ing God. Profound awareness of God was possessing all his soul—God the Heavenly Father, so near him in his work, in wakeful nights when anxieties pressed in upon him, in peaceful nights when he prayed long under the stars; the Heavenly Father who gave the flowers their beauty, the birds their food, and noted the fluttering unfledged sparrow's fall from its nest.

In all these relations a vision of ideal life was forming in his mind. He saw life as it was, saw the good and the bad, the compassionate and forgiving, the spiteful and vengeful, the pure in heart, the poor in spirit, the meek, the proud and the contemptuous. He saw life as it was and as it ought to be. He saw exactly what was needed. He thought long over the revolutionary plans and propaganda of Judas of Gamala or his successors. He watched young men of his own age leave home with the light of adventure in their eyes to conspire with the revolutionists. He saw a better way, a way that grew brighter and seemed always truer as he held it up before the Heavenly Father.

It is not impossible to picture the character making process that went on in Jesus, for we have learned from his teaching the elements of enduring character and the process by which they come into being. But when it is all done we seem not to have accounted for that which appeared later in his public life. There seem to be certain original dimensions of personality which we do not measure, a certain something coming up in him with overflowing fulness from the underlying life of God which we do not understand. Evidence of this we find later in the period when his kindling sense of mission was upon him.

CHAPTER VI

JESUS' INTRODUCTION TO PUBLIC LIFE

JESUS entered public life [1] in the midst of a period of national excitement which was religious as well as political. While the political revolutionary movement of Judas and Saddouk, or their successors in leadership, perhaps now more highly developed in the north, was slowly gathering the momentum that finally resulted in the destruction of Jerusalem, a movement exclusively religious [2] was stirring the hearts of the people in the south, in Judæa. While the revolutionist was urging men to resent taxation, the prophet John was urging men to repent of their sins. "John came who baptized in the wilderness and preached the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins. And there went out unto him all the country of Judæa and all they of Jerusalem and were

[1] The date of Jesus' entrance upon public life cannot be certainly fixed. Lk. III:23 says that Jesus at this time was "about" thirty years old. If about thirty means exactly thirty, and if the date of his birth was 6 B.C. (p. 51), then his public life began in 24 A.D. However, this does not agree with the statement in Lk. III:1-2 that John the Baptist began preaching in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, which would be some time between 26 and 29 A.D. according as the reign is reckoned to begin A.D. 12 when Tiberius became joint provincial ruler with Augustus or A.D. 14 when he succeeded him. Perhaps the expression "about thirty" might be used of a man two or three years older than thirty and perhaps the birth year might be 5 B.C. instead of 6 B.C. A not improbable date therefore is A.D. 27.

[2] The ruling Herod naturally saw in it possibilities of political mischief, Jos. *Ant.* XVIII:5:2.

baptized of him in the river Jordan confessing their sins." [3]

The religious movement which John led must have to a certain extent helped the revolutionary movement on. Many in the crowds who heard John announcing the nearness of the Judgment Day and the New Age did not content themselves with being baptized but also joined the Judas-Saddouk revolutionary groups. They not merely repented of their sins but were ready also to use violent measures for bringing in the Kingdom. Jesus had such persons in mind when he later said: "From the days of John the Baptist the Kingdom of Heaven is being taken by violence and violent men are seizing it by force." [4]

Jesus, who in his northern Galilean home had studied the political movement for a long time, cast his lot in with the religious movement in the south, and, as it has turned out, by so doing gave it a permanent place in men's minds.

In order to understand Jesus' action it is necessary to understand the character of the prophet John and the nature of his movement. According to Luke's Gospel John was an only child, born late in the life of Judæan priestly parents. His parents consecrated him to an ascetic life and he grew up somewhere in the country districts of Judæa, perhaps near the great Essene farms (p. 34), drinking no wine, living on desert food, dried locusts and wild honey. He wore over his shoulders a hairy pelt, perhaps in conscious imitation of ancient prophets (Zech. XIII:4), and about his waist not a sash or cord, but a leather strap.[5] With his rough dress and uncut hair [6] he must have looked like a modern dervish.

[3] Mk. I:4-5.

[4] Mt. XI:12.

[5] Lk. I:5-6, 15, 39, 80, Mk. 1:6. "Camels' hair" might mean a cloak woven of camels' hair.

[6] He was probably a Nazarite, *cf.* Numbers VI:1-5, with Lk. I:15.

Just how John's movement began is not clear. There may originally have been some gathering of ascetics who fasted and prayed and consecrated themselves to holy living by a baptism,[7] but soon the movement took a more popular form. There were several reasons why great crowds poured out from Jerusalem and the surrounding country in response to the rumor that such a man was making a proclamation and beginning to gather a band of followers about him in the Jordan wilderness. The first was the exciting character of his announcement: The Judgment Day and the Kingdom of God are at hand; repent and be ready! Judgment was represented to be very near. It was as if the farmer had already come, winnowing-shovel in hand, to separate wheat from chaff. The ax was laid at the roots of the trees while the farmer was making a final inspection to determine which to save and which to cut down.[8] Furthermore, John's movement was instantly popular because it was expected that in the last days just before the Judgment a group of God's ancient prophets would return to his people to prepare them for the Judgment, chief among whom would be the old hero-prophet Elijah, and John resembled Elijah in his dress.[9] Furthermore, Elijah had disappeared in the very region where John was now preaching with an uncompromising sternness that seemed like the old prophet. Elijah had re-entered the earth where he left it to prepare the nation for the great Day of God's Judgment that would usher in his Kingdom!

The national sins against which John preached were racial pride, greed for money and indifference to human

[7] See Jackson and Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. I, pp. 101-6.

[8] Mt. III:2, 10, 12.

[9] Mt. XVI:14, Mk. IX:11, Mal. IV:5-6, II Kings I:8.

need. Unlike Judas and Saddouk he called for order rather than for revolution. Soldiers were not to get money by browbreating and blackmailing civilians, and were to be content with their wages. The publicans were to be honest and all men were to be quick to relieve the needy.[10] His message was like that of the most ethical of the old Hebrew prophets, whose teaching Jesus had studied from boyhood.

John emphasized his message by a dramatic ceremony which symbolized its meaning and gave him his peculiar title, "The Baptizer." He called on all men to go down into the Jordan in his presence [11] and immerse themselves in its waters as a dramatic declaration that they had repented and wished to be morally clean. This was a familiar ceremony, performed by all foreigners who became Jewish proselytes, but now, just before the Judgment Day, all the nation was called on to perform it. The banks of the Jordan were crowded with excited multitudes who, as opportunity was from time to time given by the prophet, stretched their hands to heaven confessing their sins, called on God for forgiveness, crowded into the water for baptism and emerged singing Psalms.[12]

Out of the crowds who flocked to hear him a body of "disciples" was formed, the nucleus of which may have existed before he became a public character. He taught these disciples to observe frequent periods of fasting and to use forms of prayer.[13] This body of disciples continued with him as long as he lived and did not break up

[10] Lk. III:7-14.

[11] "Before him" Lk. III:7, Codex D.

[12] *Cf.* Sibylline Oracles, IX:164 *ff.* "Wash your whole bodies in ever-running rivers and, stretching your hands to heaven, seek forgiveness for your former deeds, and with praises ask pardon for your bitter ungodliness."

[13] Lk. V:33, XI:1.

after his death. Twenty years later some of them were found outside Palestine, in Ephesus.[14] At the end of the first century such a sect was still to be reckoned with by Christian preachers in the vicinity of Ephesus, for the first three chapters of the Gospel of John (produced near Ephesus) seem to assume its existence by repeatedly emphasizing the inferiority of John the Baptist to Jesus.[15] There are still later traces of it.[16]

The power of John's personality was such that many among the crowds began to wonder whether he was not himself the one whom God would select to act as his Messiah in the approaching Judgment Day.[17] It was this disposition that led John to speak of the "Coming One" in terms of comparison with himself. He would himself not be found fit to stoop and untie the sandal thong of the Mightier One when he should arrive. That this Mightier One was thought of by John as the Messianic Leader in the Coming Kingdom, and not as another prophet coming to prepare the people for the Kingdom, is evident from the fact that he is represented to be the one who will send the Spirit of God surging through the hearts of men, a morally purifying baptism, of which John's water baptism was only the weak symbol, and the one whose Judgment Day will be a baptism of fire for the unrepentant.[18] This function of fiery judg-

[14] Acts XIX:4.

[15] I:6-9, 19-20, 26-27, 29-30, III:26-30.

[16] Clementine Recognitions I:54, 60.

[17] Lk. III:15. The fact that he was not of the David family (in the tribe of Judah) would have seemed no insuperable objection in their minds. A century and a half earlier (Testaments of Twelve Patriarchs) there had been a large party who reached the conclusion that one of the Maccabean priest-kings (of the tribe of Levi) would turn out to be the Messiah, and John, as we have seen, belonged to the tribe of Levi.

[18] Mt. III:11.

ment and sending of God's spirit is Messianic. It will show that the Kingdom has arrived and not simply drawn near.

And yet it is noticeable that John does not use an unequivocal Messianic title in describing the Coming One. He does not call him "Son of David" which would have encouraged men to expect a warrior king and so would have played into the hands of the revolutionary leaders. Neither does he call him "Son of Man," or even use the neutral title "The Messiah," or "Christ." Perhaps it was not clear to his own mind exactly how the Great Leader in the New Age of Righteousness would function. Or, more probably, he may have shrunk from any specific reference to a "Messianic Ruler" for this would naturally have made his movement suspicious in the eyes of the Roman authorities whose Herodian spies were very likely in the crowds. He preferred rather to characterize him, as the Great Propagator of Righteousness, the One Baptizing with the Holy Spirit and with Fire.

In the course of time Jesus appeared among the crowds at the Jordan and went down into the baptismal waters with the rest. This fact later caused the early Christians considerable embarrassment. It was easy for Jewish opposers of the Christian movement to say that Jesus by this act declared himself a sinner—and so no true Messiah—and also confessed himself inferior to John, since the one under whose auspices baptism is received would be greater than the one who came seeking baptism.[19] The Matthew Gospel, which more than either Mark or Luke shows consciousness of Jewish opposition in its environment, guards against this misrepresentation by reporting a dialogue, in which John is made to recognize Jesus' superiority and in which the baptism is declared to be an

[19] *Cf.* I Cor. 1:12-16.

act of positive righteousness rather than a confession of sin, an act of righteous obedience to the voice of God in his soul.[20] John's Gospel which was also written in the midst of sharp Jewish antagonism omits the baptism of Jesus entirely.

All three Synoptic Gospels describe the heavens opening as Jesus was coming out of the water, a dove which is said to be the Holy Spirit, coming down to him, and a voice out of the open heavens calling him the Beloved Son and expressing approval of his past life. He is no sinner. In the Matthew Gospel the spirit of the dialogue between Jesus and John is further made evident by representing the voice to have addressed John and pointed out Jesus: "This is my Beloved Son." In Mark and Luke Jesus is addressed: "Thou art my Beloved Son." It seems clear that the compilers of the Gospel intend this to mean that Jesus is announced by God from heaven to be the Messiah. God's Holy Spirit comes upon him for his Messianic work. They do not understand the announcement to have been a public one, for they later represent the people to be ignorant of Jesus' Messiahship and meant by Jesus to be kept in ignorance of it.[21] The meaning of the incident was perfectly plain to the early Christians as they looked back upon it in the light of all that happened afterward. But what is plain enough afterward is not always so unmistakably clear at the time.

That John at the time did not think of Jesus as necessarily the Messiah, the Mightier One, whose coming was felt by him to be so near, is indicated by the fact that

[20] Mt. III:13-15. "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to the Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. But John would have hindered him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? But Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffereth him."

[21] Mk. VIII:27-30.

later when he was in prison he sent messengers to Jesus to inquire whether he felt himself to be the Messiah, the Coming One.[22] It is perhaps not impossible to regard this later action of John as due to temporary doubt occasioned by the gloom of prison life. But it seems more probable that John's question marked the beginning of a surmise that Jesus might be the Messiah, a surmise occasioned by Jesus' wonderful deeds. This is clearly the idea of the compilers of the Gospel: "Now when John heard in the prison the works of the Christ he sent by his disciples and said unto him, Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?" Jesus, in reply to John's question, sent back a description of himself in terms that would naturally suggest Isaiah's vision of Messianic days and works,[23] and added to it a personal injunction calculated to encourage John to watch for further developments and not be offended by him as the scribes had been. Furthermore the fact that John had retained his disciples and that they had been willing to stay with him instead of going to Jesus, indicates that John had not thought Jesus to be the Messiah.

Did Jesus himself find an assurance of the Messiahship in the baptismal experience? In what frame of mind, with what purpose and expectations, did Jesus make the journey from Nazareth to Judæa and what experience did he have in connection with his baptism? He came to the Jordan a mature man, who had reflected for years on the great themes of religion, and who had developed an experience which was capable of sustaining the great responsibility that was later laid upon him. He also found himself in harmony with the ideas of the prophet John and desired to identify himself with John's movement.

[22] Mt. XI:2-6, Lk. VII:18-19.
[23] Is. XXXV:5-6, LXI:1.

This is evident enough from the fact that he came to the Jordan, but also appears later in his eulogy of John in which he declared that no greater man had ever lived; John was the equal of Abraham, Moses and David![24] Jesus' public life shows him often in close social connection with publicans and sinners in whose capacity for, and inclination to, repentance he had large confidence. Now he joined them as they passed penitently down into the river. His soul was profoundly stirred and as he came out of the waters he was praying.[25] Then the vision broke forth in his soul! The dove and the voice are not to be thought of as something that could be photographed and dictographed but as features of a profound spiritual experience producing a physical effect determined by current habits of thought and local conditions. The mind of a Jew would be psychologically prepared for a message through a vision and a voice. The Spirit of God was thought of as like a fluttering bird.[26] The vision did not produce the inner experience, but the inner experience produced the vision. The sudden strong up-welling life of the Heavenly Father in the depths of his soul could have seemed to him nothing less than the Spirit from heaven. The new sense of being not simply a son of the Heavenly Father, to which he had been long accustomed, but of being "The Son, The Beloved" could be nothing less than the voice of God calling him to assume some form of leadership in the New Age the expectation of which was thrilling the hearts of thousands. He had come with no ambition to rival John, simply to take his place among the multitudes with a deep passion for God's New Age

[24] Lk. VII:28.
[25] Lk. III:21.
[26] *Cf.* Gen. I:2; Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, pp. 47-50.

of righteousness, and now he found a new world of action suddenly opening to him and presenting problems that filled his soul with awe and drove him to solitude and prayer.

CHAPTER VII

THE PERIOD OF DIFFICULT DECISION

WE have seen that various views of the Kingdom of God were current among the Jews in Jesus' day (ch. iv). They differed as to its ideals, the methods by which these ideals were to be realized, the length of its duration, its immediate ruler, its relation to foreigners and its relation to the existing heavens and earth. We have not to think of Jesus as seeing clearly beforehand step by step the career that he was now beginning as leader in this vast enterprise. If he had possessed such foresight in detail his after life would necessarily have been artificial and his ability to draw men to him with morally redeeming power far less than it has proved to be. Such leadership was for him an unexplored country into which he had now to make his pioneering way. There are indications, to be noted later, that he was not at first sure that this leadership involved any one of the different careers technically called Messianic.[1] It is because he faced problems hard to solve and with immense possibilities of good and evil hanging upon his decisions that Christian experience, though not always Christian theology, has recognized in him "one that

[1] If the virgin birth was a fact and Jesus had already been informed of it, such information would not have changed this situation. Alexander the Great may have believed, or half believed, the story that a god was his father, but this did not relieve him from the responsibility of planning his campaigns.

hath been in all points tempted like as we are."[2] He had now to interpret to himself in terms of definite action the meaning of his experience at baptism. He had received summons within the depths of his own soul to some form of leadership that was first of all a leadership of the nation, for no truly religious Jew at that time thought of God's Reign in the earth as to be realized in any other way than through God's People. Jesus throughout his career dealt primarily with all problems of life and character as they confronted him among his own people. Two questions he had now to answer: First, what ideal of life ought God's Son, the Beloved, to hold before God's People as he leads them on into God's New Age; that is, what will daily life and character in the Kingdom of God be like? And second, what practical program shall be adopted for realizing this ideal?

For the consideration of these questions Jesus went away alone into the wilderness, driven by a strong inner compulsion.[3] The disciples of John the Baptist, with whom Jesus had just been associating, observed frequent periods of fasting and prayer. Although Jesus differed from them in this particular,[4] their practice seemed to him appropriate for this great crisis. He is said to have remained in seclusion for forty days. The Gospels present a report of what took place during these six weeks in the form of a dialogue between Jesus and Satan. This dialogue can be read in thirty seconds and the entire narrative in one minute. The dialogue is concerned with stones to be turned into bread, a proposed leap from some high point on the temple to the pavement below, and an

[2] Heb. IV:15.
[3] Mk. I:12.
[4] Mk. II:18-19.

instantaneous vision[5] of all the kingdoms within the limits of the composite Roman Empire and beyond. This reads like an attempt to state the gist of the great struggle that went on for six weeks within the soul of Jesus in the form of parables, or semi-parables, a method of presentation that Jesus often used in his teaching. In this presentation rival ideals of a leader's career compete for Jesus' adoption. It is possible to suppose that this narrative was the creation of the Gospel makers who wished in this way to show to their Jewish opponents that the current Jewish ideal of Messiahship, which Jesus did not adopt, was endorsed by Satan! But on the other hand it is clear that this antagonism between two ideals of leadership must have existed first of all in the thought and soul of Jesus himself. He himself at some time had to decide to what ideals and program he would commit himself. It is entirely in accord with a reasonable probability to suppose that this report was made by Jesus himself to his disciples at some time in their history when they especially needed it for the development of their own characters. It is chiefly in differences of detail in the narratives presented in Matthew and Luke that the shaping hand of the Gospel makers is to be seen.

What light then does this condensed and very suggestive narrative throw on the actual experience of Jesus during these eventful weeks? The conduct of Moses in a similar situation is evidently in the background. The three quotations of scripture made by Jesus are all taken from the section of Deuteronomy in which God places before Moses his ideal of national life at a time when Moses might have led God's people into God's New Land if he had not failed in the day of his temptation.[6] Moses received this ideal

[5] "In a moment of time," Lk. IV:5.

[6] Deut. VI:1-3, VIII:3, VI:16, 13, *cf.* I:37.

during forty days of lonely fasting.[7] (That this was in the mind of the compiler of the Matthew Gospel is seen in the fact that he adds the phrase "and forty nights," quoting Deuteronomy.) Many thought of the Messiah as one who would be a second Moses. Moses' statement about his successor was thought to be a reference to the Messiah: "A prophet shall the Lord God raise up unto you from among your brethren like unto me." [8] It was natural that Jesus should study carefully this revelation of God made to Moses. If he could read Hebrew he may have taken with him into the wilderness a roll of scripture containing this part of the law and reflected upon it for weeks.

As the lonely days passed Jesus had the consciousness of contending with something evil. Various possible ideals and programs passed before his mind. Some of them were at first very attractive and pulled him powerfully toward them, but after longer reflection they seemed to him inferior to others, therefore to be rejected and attributed to the source of all evil, which in the thought of Jesus' day was the personal Satan. It was the reign on earth of the evil Adversary, Satan, that was to be ended by the coming of the Kingdom of God. Jesus, therefore, would naturally have thought of Satan as intimately concerned with what was going on in his own mind.

One great phase of Jesus' experience during these weeks is presented in the parable of Stones turned into Bread, or a stone to be turned into a loaf of bread.[9] Everyone expected the Great Leader to see to it that the New Age should be characterised not only by righteous obedience to God's law but also by an abundance of food and other

[7] Deut. IX:9, 11, 18.
[8] Acts III:22.
[9] Mt. IV:3, Lk. IV:3.

physical comforts. Both of these characteristics appear in Deuteronomy.[10] Moses had secured free bread for the people in the wilderness.[11] In the Apocalypse of Baruch, a document current soon after Jesus' day, this description occurs:

"The earth also will yield its fruit ten thousandfold, and on one vine there will be a thousand branches, and each branch will produce a thousand clusters, and each cluster will produce a thousand grapes, and each grape will produce a cor of wine. And those who have hungered will rejoice: moreover, also they will behold marvels every day. For winds will go forth from before Me to bring every morning the fragrance of aromatic fruits, and at the close of the day clouds distilling the dew of health. And it will come to pass at that self-same time that the treasury of manna will again descend from on high, and they will eat of it in those years, because these are they who have come to the consummation of time." [12]

The practical question that naturally arose was, on which of these characteristics, righteousness or material prosperity, should the heavier emphasis be placed; toward the attainment of which one should he immediately move out. Jesus' nature, as will appear later, was extremely sensitive to the needs of the poor. Their lack of food and clothing, the pains of the diseased bodies on every side, which the meagre medical knowledge of the day could not cure, stirred his compassion. He had thought of their condition for years in Nazareth. His own present hunger and weakness were a vivid reminder of how multitudes in the nation and in the great world felt as they went to bed hungry and weak and sick night after night. The first thing that God's Son ought to do, so it would naturally

[10] Deut. VII:12-26, X:12-22.
[11] Jn. VI:31-32.
[12] XXIX:5-8.

seem, would be to stop this terrible suffering. This Jesus felt strongly inclined to do on some such large scale as God's power would now make feasible.[13] But this, after long reflection, he felt he ought not to do. The real nature of the temptation, in this case and in the other two as well, appears in Jesus' reply. He shows what he was tempted to do in telling why he will not do it. The reason that he denied his natural benevolent inclination here was because, as God had told Moses in the earlier revelation of his ideal for the nation, "man"—man in general, all men—"shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." That is, the first responsibility of God's Son in the New Age was not to provide physical comforts, but to get men to listening to the voice of God, to fix upon men the habit of feeling and yielding to the ever present energy of the will of God pressing upward in their souls for expression in action. If this disposition could be secured, human brotherhood would result and physical comforts would abound for all men. He determined to attack directly the cause of the disease and not merely to alleviate its symptoms. The conclusion that he reached here affected all his subsequent teaching and policy. He told those who were worrying over lack of food and clothing, that their Heavenly Father knew well their need of these things and that when men set their hearts on the "righteousness," the fair play and good will, of God's Kingdom, a civilization would result in

[13] It is often said that Jesus was here tempted to do something for himself which other men could not do for themselves, to exempt himself from their physical limitations. This can hardly be the case, for it will appear later that Jesus had a sublime confidence in his ability to share with other men whatever power he himself possessed. He need not have hesitated here to do for himself what he was perfectly willing to show other people how to do for themselves.

which all these things would be added as a natural consequence.[14] The oldest narrative source, Mark's Gospel, represents Jesus at times to have avoided the healing of disease because it seemed to be threatening the success of his main object, the propagation of righteousness.[15]

In the parable of the Leap from the Temple Roof Jesus reports that he saw himself in imagination on some lofty part of the temple looking down on the pavement below, perhaps at thousands of people waiting for the temple trumpet notes to sound the signal for falling upon their faces in prayer. It is possible that he contemplated for a time, in these days of tense feeling, the feasibility of going to the temple and expecting God to present him to the nation by some such impressive miracle. This would have met popular expectation: "The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple."[16] For a time a sentence in the ninety-first Psalm seemed to encourage such venturesome reliance on God's protection. This Psalm expresses such sense of nearness to God as had been developed in Jesus during the Nazareth years. It begins, "He that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High, shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty." In v. 13 it mentions such triumph of man over powerful and venomous animals, "the lion and the adder," as was to be man's in the New Age.[17] It closes with a promise of seeing Jehovah's "salvation," which would mean life in

[14] Mt. VI:31-33.

[15] Mk. I:32-38, 43-45.

[16] Mal. III:1.

[17] Is. XI, Lk. X:17-19. In the Mark Gospel (I:13) ideas of this sort, current in the early church, are expressed. It was felt that retinues of the Devil's wild beasts and God's angels were both in the vicinity as Satan and the Holy Spirit worked upon the soul of the Messiah.

the Kingdom of God. This Psalm describes God's angels holding up a falling man:

> "For he will give his angels charge over thee,
> To keep thee in all thy ways.
> They shall bear thee up in their hands,
> Lest thou dash thy foot against a stone."

But as Jesus reflected on the situation this adventure seemed to him not to receive God's approval and he attributed the suggestion of it to an evil source. His reply, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God," shows that he came to regard such action as presuming upon God, as rushing forward in the enthusiasm of a newly discovered mission expecting God to sustain him in whatever picturesque exhibition of power he might wish to make. He must not assume that his sense of leadership is necessarily "Messianic." He must not seek personal prestige. He must rather wait for God to thrust him forward in his own good time into whatever sort of leadership God may will. As a result of this conclusion he kept the sense of Messianic leadership, which did develop in him later, a secret from the public until the very end when the revelation of it cost him his life. His mission was not at first to overbear men with startling exhibitions of sheer power, but to hold before the nation ideals of righteousness that should win their assent, produce character and prepare them for the life of the New Age.

The third parable is that of World Empire through Temporary Compromise with Satan. The Kingdom of God in Jewish thought was to be a world empire in which Jerusalem would be the capital and all positions of influence be held by Jews. What Romans were in the Roman Empire, Jews would be in the Kingdom of God. Jesus, therefore, by all the traditions of his people was

compelled to think of the empires of the world, the magnificence of their buildings, the glory of the burnished helmets and armor of vast armies, the majesty of the courts of the Emperor, his high officials and under-kings in all parts of the world. In some moment of ecstatic vision all the golden glory of royalty throughout the world passed before him. His profound desire was to secure all this for Jehovah, to let the everlasting glory of God's radiant heavens into the royal courts and to transform their millions of subjects into obedient sons of the Living God. The real temptation here lay in the choice of a method of accomplishing this high purpose. The method that is represented to have appealed to Jesus for a time was that of temporary compromise with evil, a moment on his knees before Satan, in the symbolism of the parable. It is a real temptation. May a man quietly acquiesce in one shady deal of a corporation of which he is a member and thereby win a vast fortune to spend for various good enterprises for the success of which he is willing to make almost any conceivable personal sacrifice? Jesus' reply was that a man should never do anything else than worship God. "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou serve." His only course is to do right now, to be honest now. He must make no complaisant compromise with evil.

Some of the concrete forms in which this temptation appealed to Jesus are to be discerned in his subsequent career. He refused to make any compromise with the scribes. If no such startling demonstration of power as he had contemplated in the second temptation was to be made, then he must win his way to world dominion by personal influence. First of all he would have to become influential among his own people, and the dominant force there was the scribes. As appears later, they would have

been glad to endorse him and utilize the ability he immediately began to show if he would have compromised with them at certain points that seemed to him vital. Might he not do so for a time and afterward all the more effectively push on to the attainment of his real ends? Must he not compromise with the priests, overlook their abuses of the temple administration for a while, be recognized by them as a valuable man of great ability, become the confidential friend of Annas, Caiaphas, and the Roman procurator, and then utilize his position for the furtherance of his high purposes? Or, on the other hand, must he not acquiesce in the military Messianism of Judas and Saddouk or their successors for a time, win their support and afterward try to turn it to the accomplishment of his great moral ambitions? For all this his answer was that he must simply be true to his best vision now and all the time, taking whatever consequences might come.

With the settling of this last question [18] he felt that the struggle was for the present over. He was victor and, in the language of the parable, with consciousness of a victor's superiority over the vanquished, ordered his antagonist to leave the field: "Get thee hence, Satan." These temptations may sometimes have returned and other temptations surely arose as the situation developed. Luke implies this when he says that the devil "departed from him for a season." [19]

During these days in the wilderness Jesus passed through a profound religious experience which may well have deepened the lines in his face and set a great purpose more firmly in his soul. The things that became clear were that he was resolved at any cost to obey God, that his primary purpose would be to bring men into fellow-

[18] Luke arranges the temptations in a different order.
[19] Lk. IV:13.

ship with God so that they should be always listening to his voice, that he could make no startling announcement of Messianic mission or even be sure that his mission was Messianic, and that he would make no compromise with any form of evil, however expedient it might seem to be to do so. Important questions regarding his future remained unanswered. He had yet to feel his way along as God should open the path before him.

CHAPTER VIII

JESUS THE GREATER SUCCESSOR OF THE PROPHET JOHN; FAMOUS PROPHET AND HEALER THROUGHOUT GALILEE

THE account of Jesus' forty days in the wilderness is immediately followed in our oldest Gospel by the statement that "after John was delivered up,[1] Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of God and saying, The time is fulfilled and the Kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye and believe in the gospel." [2] What Jesus did between the time of his wilderness experience and John's imprisonment is not clear from the first three Gospels.[3] By his experience at baptism and in the

[1] "Delivered up" might mean executed as in Rom. IV:25, but means imprisoned here, since he appears later as a prisoner (Mt. XI:2). He attacked Herod publicly for scandalous conduct in his family affairs, was arrested and after a time of imprisonment was executed (Mk. VI:17-29). It seems to be assumed in Mark that the readers already know about John's being delivered up, or that someone is at hand to explain it to them. The Gospel was not written for those who were wholly dependent on it for information.

[2] Mk. I:14-15.

[3] In the Fourth Gospel, which differs from the first three in its general viewpoint and method of presentation (p. 21), John the Baptist points out Jesus, The Word made flesh, the Messianic Lamb of God, to some of his disciples, who instantly abandon John and join Jesus. Jesus without any previous activity calls on certain others to follow him and is at once possessed of a body of "disciples." He very soon proceeds with them to make his appearance at the great national festival in Jerusalem. There he at once takes authoritative possession of the temple, performs "signs" which captivate

wilderness God seemed to have withdrawn him from the following of John the Baptist where he had in humility been ready to take his place. In faithfulness to the conviction that God was laying upon him the responsibility of higher leadership he could not work under John the Baptist. On the other hand his respect for John and his movement was so great that he could not do anything that would seem like rivaling John or distracting attention from him and his movement. But so soon as John's work stopped Jesus was instantly free to begin.

In his work he was both like and unlike John. He was less irregular and picturesque than John. He wore no weird dress. He did not stay in the wilderness engaged in fasting and prayers, but he utilized the synagogue which brought him to the social center of every community. He uttered no impassioned harangues, but "taught" more quietly. Yet he was like John in the assertion of a prophet's authority. In his synagogue teaching he did not cite the names of great rabbinic scholars for this or that opinion regarding the meaning of scripture: "they were astonished at his teaching for he taught them as having authority and not as the scribes." [4] The substance of his message too was like that of John. He went before synagogue audiences all over Galilee announcing,

large numbers in the city full of the Passover crowds, makes a leading Pharisee ruler confess that his conversation is too deep for him to understand, and carries on a baptizing propaganda that entirely overshadows John's. Then, moved by concern for John's reputation, he travels northward with his disciples, captures for himself an entire Samaritan city on the way and, when he reaches Galilee, finds the Galileans eager to receive him because amazed at the signs they had seen him do in Jerusalem. After describing one "sign" nothing further is said at this point of any activity in Galilee; the scene shifts at once again to Jerusalem and thereafter little attention is paid to Galilee.

[4] Mk. 1:22.

as John had done in the wilderness of Judæa, that the time set by God for the dawning of the New Age was near. The Kingdom was at hand. Men must prepare for its Judgment Day by repenting. There is perhaps less amplification of the idea of judgment and more emphasis on the glad life of the New Age which made its announcement a "gospel." The joy of his own present participation in the life of the Coming Kingdom filled his soul. He felt like a bridegroom in the midst of wedding festivities (p. 108). This was an experience fundamentally different from that of John. Unlike John he said nothing about the coming of a Mightier One. On the other hand there was no declaration that he himself was a Mightier One. As we have seen, no such consciousness of Messianic leadership had been allowed to develop during the time of his temptation.

In one particular Jesus seemed clearly superior to John. It soon appeared that he had power to cure disease and to free the tortured minds of demoniacs from the power of demons that were understood to have secured housing in their bodies. This action of Jesus was thought of as a direct attack on the power of Satan, a part of whose realm was this world, and who in his realm let his under devils loose to roam about among men inflicting disease and other injury wherever they could. The evil realm of darkness and disease was expected to disappear whenever the light and life of the Kingdom of God should appear. This action on the part of Jesus, therefore, seemed like the first breath of the New Age. The Kingdom of God was drawing near. This was not proof that Jesus was the Supreme Leader, what many would have called the "Messiah." Even John the Baptist, in his prison, expecting the Coming One, was not sure that he could draw this inference. He sent disciples to Jesus to ask whether

he really was the Coming One or merely his forerunner.[5] But this activity marked Jesus as in some way superior to John, as John's question clearly indicated.

Jesus' power over disease and demons is vividly portrayed in the oldest Gospel. On one occasion[6] in the evening after the sun had set on a Sabbath day and the Sabbath was, therefore, ended, the street in front of the house where Jesus was staying, so filled up with the sick and their friends that the whole city seemed to be there. The synagogue audience earlier in the day had been thrown into great excitement by the outbreak of a demoniac from whom Jesus had quickly expelled the demon. On the same day in the house of his host Jesus had taken a fever stricken woman by the hand and caused the fever instantly to abate. The report of what had happened brought the crowds to his door in the evening. Jesus went out among the crowds, cured a great many suffering from various diseases and expelled many demons.[7]

It would be interesting to know how and when Jesus first discovered that he had this power and what was his religious experience in the exercise of it. In expelling demons he did not use any formula of exorcism, as others seem to have done who commanded in someone's powerful name that the demon should come out.[8] He simply ordered the demon to come out: "With authority he commandeth even the unclean spirits and they obey him"; "He cast out the spirits with a word."[9] The only hint he ever gave as to his method of accomplishing cures of mind and body indicates prayer. "This kind can come out by

[5] Mt. XI:3.
[6] Mk. I:21-34.
[7] Mk. I:34, Mt. VIII:16 "he healed all," Lk. IV:40 "he laid his hands on every one."
[8] Mk. IX:38, Acts XIX:13-15.
[9] Mk. I:27, Mt. VIII:16.

nothing save by prayer," he said once when questioned by his disciples about his cure of a desperate case of demoniacal possession.[10] In the Fourth Gospel's interpretation of his power, prayer is distinctly emphasized as the source of it. He is represented as saying at the grave of Lazarus. "Father, I thank thee that thou heardest me and I knew that thou hearest me always." [11] As he opened to God in prayer a soul that was stirred with compassion for those with sick bodies and disordered minds, something from the underlying life of God welled up within him and passed in accordance with psychic laws into the minds, and through the minds into the bodies, of the diseased. His most fundamental teaching about prayer, which perhaps grew out of such experience, represented it to be getting something from God with which to meet the need of another man. The classic statement of this is the illustration of the man who at midnight knocked at his neighbor's door and said: "Friend, lend me three loaves; for a friend of mine is come to me from a journey and I have nothing to set before him." [12] It was possibly his success in curing disease quickly that gave Jesus his confidence in the instantaneous response of God to his prayer. We find him saying (as it might be translated) that if anyone "shall believe that what he is saying is happening he shall have it." [13] This had been his experience in healing the sick. The movement toward health began on the spot, while he was still praying. If he prayed for the curing of someone at a distance he found afterward that it had taken place while he prayed, which

[10] Mk. IX:29.
[11] Jn. XI:41-42.
[12] Lk. XI:5-6.
[13] Mk. XI:23. The present tenses may be regarded as progressive presents.

gave him warrant for saying in connection with the utterance just quoted: "All things whatsoever ye pray and ask for believe that ye *received* them and ye shall have them."[14] As will be seen later in the consideration of the teaching of Jesus (p. 262), he felt that all the power he experienced within himself was a prophecy of that which would operate in all men in the New Age.

Jesus' power in prayer was not the entire explanation of his cures. He himself often attributed it to the faith of the diseased: "Your faith has made you well." It is easy to see what "faith" would have been in the case of the mother-in-law of Peter just cited.[15] This woman upon whom fever had come was in the attitude of expectation. She knew Jesus as a famous prophet, like John the Baptist, announcing the nearness of the New Age with its health and plenty for all Jews. She knew that he had taken her son-in-law into his inner circle of disciples. She showed the current confidence in the healing power of a prophet's touch. The psychic conditions of a cure were present when Jesus with his prayerful spirit came to her, took her hand in his and confidently raised her to her feet.

While the evidence indicates that Jesus prayed in connection with curing diseases of mind and body, another phase of his religious experience is also emphasized in this connection. He seems to have recognized within himself a certain Power for which he felt an awesome reverence. As we shall see later, he spoke of it in a discussion with the scribes regarding his ability to order demons out of human bodies. This Power he called "the Holy Spirit." Men might speak all sorts of venomous words

[14] Mk. XI:24; *cf.* Mt. VIII:5-13.
[15] Mk. I:30-31.

against anyone else, including himself, according to the compiler of Q, and still be freely forgiven by God's grace, but to speak such words against this Power, through whose activity within him God answered his prayer for the demoniacs, involved an unspeakable peril.[16]

We naturally ask the question here, What actually happened in these cases? That Jesus should have cured certain forms of disease in the way indicated above does not seem at all improbable. The cases of demoniacal possession at first thought present special difficulty, particularly because the demoniacs are represented as clearly recognizing the Messiahship of Jesus at a time when it was concealed from normal people. This was not a difficulty for the Gospel writers. It was assumed by them that demons would have an acquaintance with the beings and activities of the unseen world which human beings do not have, and that they would, of course, recognize the real character of Jesus, the Son of God. While the psychological problems of double personality and other forms of mental disease may not yet be fully explained, we move decisively away from the supposition, almost axiomatic in Jesus' day, that "devils" get into the bodies of men. How did it come to pass then that these demoniacs saw in Jesus "the Holy One of God," come to send them back to the abyss before the proper time, that is, the Judgment Day, the time when everyone knew that they would have to go back where they came from? "What have we to do with thee Jesus, thou Nazarene? Art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God." "Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?"[17] If we put ourselves back into the thought world in which Jesus lived, it is not impossible to see how these ejacula-

[16] Mt. XII:31-32, Lk. XII:10, Mk. III:28-29.
[17] Mk. I:24, Mt. VIII:29.

tions burst with such force from the lips of men of disordered minds. A person would carry over into his deranged state many ideas that he had held as a sane man. All that he had ever believed about the nature of demons, their habits and their fate, he would now attribute to the demon that he as an insane man supposed to be in his body. He took into his own consciousness whatever he supposed to be the consciousness of the demon. A man whose hallucination consists in thinking himself to be Napoleon Bonaparte will talk and act as his historical knowledge of Napoleon's career enables him to know that Napoleon would talk and act. The "demoniac" heard many all about him talking in an excited way about Jesus, the nearness of the Kingdom of God and the Judgment Day. When he in the midst of eager listeners heard Jesus himself talking authoritatively about this day, he knew how such talk would excite the demon that he supposed to be within him, for on that day the demon would have to go back to the pit. The insane man may have felt Jesus' psychic influence over him with such force as would make him suspect that here was the master mind that could dispose of his demon. Or he may have heard people wondering whether Jesus might not turn out to be the Messiah as they had wondered about John the Baptist. This conjecture, which the demoniac knew would seem so terrible to the demon within him, instantly became a conviction and the way was prepared for Jesus to remove the hallucination by ordering the demon to leave. The demoniac knew that the demon must obey. When a few cases of cure had occurred and were known to other demoniacs, this view of the case would easily become somewhat general among them. Jesus is represented as suppressing the recognition of his Messiahship that came from the demoniacs. According to the Gospel writers, this was be-

cause he did not wish his Messianic consciousness to be generally known; it was to be kept as his own secret.[18] We have supposed that he did not yet know whether the sense of Leadership which God had produced within him involved "Messiahship" (p. 77), and was unwilling to have suggestions made for which God had not yet given the warrant. Of course when the Gospel writers looked back over this entire period, knowing well who Jesus turned out to be, their interpretation of everything became more precisely Messianic than it would necessarily have been at the time. To them later it seemed that Jesus, the Messiah, appeared with power to destroy Satan's empire, sent the frightened devils fleeing before him and repaired the bodies that they had weakened by disease. But at the time these inferences would not necessarily have been drawn. The people did not draw them.[19] Only now and then some wondered whether anything like this would turn out to be true.[20]

Did Jesus himself believe that demons were present in these disordered minds, or did he consciously accommodate himself to the hallucination in order more effectively to remove it? If he did not believe in the presence of demons he took no pains to make that fact evident. The Gospels show no sign of suspecting any such disbelief. Jesus' religious and ethical teaching, his teaching about man's relation to God and his fellow men, shows no trace of being affected in any vital way by belief or disbelief in the existence of demons any more than it might have been affected by belief or disbelief in the existence of disease microbes in the air about him. If he did believe in them, and they nevertheless do not exist, such belief would

[18] *Cf.* Mk. VIII:27-30.
[19] Mk. VIII:27-28.
[20] *Cf.* Mt. XII:22-23.

be considered a part of the genuinely human life that he lived in the thought world of his own time, the life that because of its genuine human experience has made him the source of moral redemption on a world scale.

CHAPTER IX

JESUS THE GREATER SUCCESSOR OF THE PROPHET JOHN (*Concluded*): TEACHER AND PROPHET RATHER THAN HEALER

IN a particular not yet noted Jesus was like John the Baptist. He soon began to form a group of "disciples." As he went from synagogue to synagogue with increasing popularity he soon had a wide acquaintance from which to select disciples. Such young men as were always eager to become the disciples of some distinguished rabbi, would naturally welcome the chance to follow a teacher so popular as Jesus and possessed of such unusual power to heal disease and expel demons, even if he had not himself been taught by any distinguished scribe. The Gospels give a very brief account of the choice of four men, of whom three later became outstanding characters among Jesus' followers.[1] They were all business men like Jesus himself. They were engaged in the fish business which took its place with agriculture and general trade as a leading industry in the country about the Sea of Galilee. Fish in large quantities were salted and sold for export as well as for the home market. He found these four men, two pairs of brothers, at their work on the shore of the Sea of Galilee, and proposed to them to come with him. They evidently knew him[2] and understood

[1] Mk. I:16-20.

[2] According to John's Gospel at least two of them had been associated with him before this in Judaea, Jn. I:40-41.

that his proposition involved at least the temporary abandonment of business. The form of his invitation was significant. In a half humorous, yet profoundly earnest, way he said: "Come with me and I will give you a chance to fish for *men!*" They were evidently to help him get the nation ready for the coming Kingdom of God.[3] To what extent John the Baptist's disciples had helped their leader make his proclamation we do not know, but in the course of no very long time Jesus used his own disciples to help him spread his message in all the Galilean towns. Two of the four men were Simon, afterward called by Jesus Simon Peter, and his brother Andrew, householders in Capernaum, a thriving business city on the north shore of the lake. It was to their house that Jesus went together with the other two men, James and John, on a Sabbath after the notable synagogue service mentioned in the last chapter, and about their house that the crowds of sick people gathered in the evening.

The point to be emphasised here is that Jesus at this time, according to the oldest Gospel, seemed very unwilling to let his dealing with disease proceed beyond a certain point. Early in the morning after the evening in which he had cured so many sick, before the rest of the household were awake, he slipped out of the city to a quiet spot

[3] Lk. V:1-11, presents a different account of Jesus' calling Peter and his associates, according to which Jesus uses Peter's boat to preach from (*cf.* Mk. IV:1). He secures for them after the preaching an immense catch of fish which makes Peter confess himself a sinner. Something like this appears in Jn. XXI, but then after the resurrection of Jesus, when Peter, who had denied Jesus at the time of his trial, might be expected to feel himself guilty as no others in the boat according to Luke do. Apparently various versions of interviews between Jesus and Peter the fisherman were current (*cf.* Lk. I:1-4), and Luke seems to have taken one or more of them for combination with the Mark narrative.

for prayer.[4] Soon after, before the heat of the day began, the street in front of the house began to fill up again with the sick and those who were curious to see the prophet deal with them. Simon and the others discovered in some way where to look for Jesus and hurried out after him to bring him back to the waiting crowds. They found that he was unwilling to go back. He had slipped away not intending to come back, perhaps in anticipation of just such a popular demand for him. He said that he must preach in the neighbouring towns and had left the house in the very early morning to begin such a preaching tour (v. 38). His sense of obligation to make his message known was decidedly stronger than his natural inclination to cure more sick people.[5] What he had prayed about in the morning twilight we should be glad to know. Perhaps the experience of the evening before had produced a recurrence of his earlier temptation, his inclination to let the relief of physical distress take precedence over the moral appeal. That this was the case seems probable in view of the peculiar behavior attributed to Jesus by the oldest Gospel in a case of sickness singled out for special description.[6] The sick man had leprosy. If we follow the Biblical description of leprosy in Leviticus XIII-XIV, it appears that the disease was not always what is now called leprosy, but instead a skin disease which appeared and sometimes after a while disappeared. It was thought to be similar in nature to certain discolorations sometimes appearing on the walls of houses, on leather

[4] Mk. I:35-38.

[5] Luke's Gospel (IV:42-43) intensifies Mark's account. The crowds came to him and laid hold of him to keep him from leaving them, but he told them that it was necessary to preach the Gospel of the Kingdom of God in other cities, that it was for this purpose that he had been "sent"—presumably by God—into public life.

[6] Mk. I:41-45, Mt. VIII:1-4, Lk. V:12-16.

articles and in woolen and linen garments. It was considered contaminating and necessitated the isolation of whatever was infected. Such an isolated person for some reason had courage to come directly to Jesus. He expressed the conviction that if Jesus were willing to do so he could cure him. According to the reading of certain manuscripts of Mark's Gospel Jesus became "angry" at this point.[7] All manuscripts from this point on agree that Jesus said he was willing, and touched him (in spite of the defilement). Mark's Gospel (alone) adds, apparently in the spirit of the word "angered," that Jesus in great agitation "thrust him forth," or urged him off (the same word in Mk. I:13, "the Spirit driveth him forth into the wilderness"). All three Gospels say that he was given strict instructions not to mention his cure to anyone, but to make the journey to Jerusalem, show himself to the priest who had ways of telling when a man's leprosy had really disappeared, make the offering required by the law in such cases and get a clean bill of health that would let him back into community life. A natural explanation of this strange language is that Jesus was greatly disturbed by the extent to which the healing of disease seemed likely to interfere with his preaching the Coming Kingdom. The reason that this so profoundly agitated him was that, as we have supposed, he had in the time of his temptation recognized this very thing as a device of Satan to defeat the great work for which God was making him responsible, namely, the moral preparation of the nation for the Com-

[7] The word "angered" was evidently offensive and early copyists took the liberty to replace it by "had compassion." Matthew and Luke, who are supposed to have been using Mark, have no word at all here, which seems to indicate that the word meaning "in compassion" had not yet displaced "angered" and that they both shrank from using the offensive word. They both also omit the other strong language in v. 43 of Mark.

ing Kingdom of God. His situation was somewhat like that of an army surgeon who is charged with the responsibility of personally bringing exceedingly important information to headquarters and who yet finds himself in a situation in which all his time is occupied by wounded men demanding surgical attention, and who suspects that this situation has come about through the sly manipulation of some sinister influence. The failure of this cured leper to do what Jesus told him to do, keep his cure secret, did actually make it impossible for Jesus to preach in towns for a time. He had to go out into the fields, away from cities, where sick people could not so easily be brought, and preach there to such as came: "But he went out and began to publish it much, and to spread abroad the matter, insomuch that Jesus could no more openly enter into a city, but was without in desert places, and they came to him from every quarter." [8]

A case of healing that probably occurred about this time in Capernaum is reported in the Matthew and Luke Gospels,[9] not in Mark. An army officer of sergeant's rank ("centurion") had a servant to whom he was strongly attached. The servant was a paralytic and in terrible distress (at the point of death, Lk.). According to the Matthew Gospel the officer went to Jesus asking for help and to his surprise Jesus at once volunteered to go to his house although it was the house of a Gentile which a Jew would not naturally care to enter. The Luke account represents him to be a Jehovah worshipping Gentile (not a proselyte) and one who had been rich enough and devout enough to build a Jewish synagogue in the city. In Luke it is not the man himself, but the elders of this synagogue, followed later by a group of the officer's "friends," who

[8] Mk. I:45.
[9] Mt. VIII:5-13, Lk. VII:1-10.

intercede with Jesus. In both accounts the man recognizes the fact that Jesus would not naturally wish to enter his house and suggests that Jesus at a distance can order the disease, or perhaps the demon who is "tormenting" (Mt.) the sick man, to leave just as the officer himself is accustomed to produce results at a distance by giving orders to his servants. Jesus was greatly astonished ("marvelled") to find such faith exhibited by a foreigner and instantly gave assurance that the sick man would be found cured. This turned out to be so. It is to be supposed that the man shared his master's confidence in Jesus' power to cure disease and had the expectation of recovery that was an essential element in "faith." Jesus expressed the conviction that this was an indication of what would happen on a large scale later; many foreigners would be found feasting in the Kingdom of God with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

In all this period Jesus said nothing in public about any sense of supreme leadership, neither, so far as the first three Gospels show, did he say anything about it to the four men who were working with him. We are left to infer that they were glad to work with him simply because of their interest in the Coming Kingdom and because of the honor of working with so distinguished a prophet, just as had been the case with the disciples of John the Baptist.

It is also to be noted that in all this period Jesus' popularity was very great. No opposition on the part of the scribes seems to have developed. They may have felt somewhat disturbed to find a religious teacher not of their class so popular. They were however in sympathy with his desire to get people to repent in order to bring on the Kingdom of God. He had seemed to share their desire to see the law of Moses universally obeyed. He

had required the leper to show himself to the priest and punctiliously obey the leper law that God had enacted through Moses. It seemed probable that they could utilize the great influence Jesus was acquiring for the furtherance of their own highest aims.

CHAPTER X

JESUS' CONFLICT WITH THE SCRIBES: THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS AND INTIMACY WITH SINNERS

THE truthfulness of the portrait of "the scribes" or "the scribes of the Pharisees" presented in the Gospels is often denied by Jewish writers. Doubtless the long line of Jewish teachers during a period of 1,900 years has presented various types of character, both agreeable and repulsive. One type may have characterized one period and a very different type another. This could certainly be said of the long line of Christian theologians and ecclesiastical leaders during the same 1,900 years. One who would attempt a fair judgment of the Pharisaism of Jesus' day is embarrassed by the fact that it expressed itself in no contemporary literature of its own. The Christian Gospels are our main nearly contemporary source and they were produced in the midst of a conflict between the Christian church and the Jewish synagogue. Jewish literature begins some two centuries later, although it records fragmentary sayings and traditions handed down orally and probably accurately from Jesus' day. Since they are so fragmentary the absence from them of some disagreeable Pharisaic trait found in the Gospel portrait is no proof that such a trait was not to be found in the days of Jesus. The assumption on which the present discussion proceeds is that since Jesus attacked the

weak points of Pharisaism and Pharisees (pp. 30-33). those to whom these weak points meant most, and who happened to be in the positions of leadership that seem often to be held by such, sprang to the front in their defense and were, therefore, the prominent figures in the Gospel picture. The better Pharisaism stayed in the obscure background. It may be that these prominent figures are painted in somewhat darker colors and with heavier hand than would have been used if the Gospels had not been produced in the heat of a conflict. But the treatment which they represent Jesus to have received from the scribes is not very different from that usually accorded spiritual enthusiasm by the extremely formalistic element of a religious body that, on the whole, may not be adequately represented by the hard formalists.

The oldest Gospel presents a series of vividly drawn pictures in which the growing hostility between Jesus and the scribes appears.[1] The first[2] is that of a paralytic to whom Jesus authoritatively announced the forgiveness of his sins. The man lived in Capernaum. When Jesus ventured back again into the city after a period of field preaching he apparently established week day teaching headquarters in a private house, presumably that belonging to his disciples, Simon and Andrew. The open court around which such a house would be built was large enough to accommodate a group of considerable size, some hundreds if crowded. This paralytic was brought to the house by four friends. They found even the covered passageway leading from the street into the inner court jammed with people listening to "the word," that is, the message about the nearness of the Kingdom of God and the way to prepare for it. The five men were per-

[1] Mk. II-III, VII:1-24.
[2] Mk. I:1-12.

haps fearful that Jesus would slip away immediately after preaching as he had done before, without waiting to cure the sick.[3] They decided to take no chances. The four men carried their sick friend by an outside stair-way up to the roof, removed a portion of the roof that was easily displaced and lowered him on his cot close to the place where Jesus was standing. A remarkable conversation, or monologue, then followed in which Jesus gave the incident a religious turn and so made it contribute decidedly to, instead of interfere with, his main purpose, the moral preparation of the nation for the New Age. Jesus' first words to him assured him that his sins were forgiven, that he was ready for the New Age and its Judgment Day. Jesus had probably been talking about repenting of sin in order to be ready, and here was a man who was ready! How did Jesus know it? The narrative says it was because he saw their "faith." "Jesus seeing their faith, saith unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins are forgiven." He read in the faces of the five men that for which his eye was always searching the faces of men. The fact that they had come to him, the prophet of repentance, with such a light in their eyes might seem evidence of their repentance. But Jesus went on to speak of an especial sense of authority that he felt within him. It was not simply that he could say what any righteous man would say, namely, that if a man has sincerely repented of his sins, it is certain that God has forgiven him. Such a general assumption underlay the message of John the Baptist and of all preachers of righteousness. Jesus seemed to have power to look into the man's soul, to feel the man repenting and to feel rising within himself the forgiving, approving love of God for the penitent man. As he could perhaps feel the tide

[3] Mk. I:36-38.

of life and health rising within him to affect the diseased minds and bodies about him,[4] so here he felt the loving energy of God moving through him toward this man, of whose penitent faith he saw such convincing evidence. He *felt* God forgiving the man's sin.

The emphasis on "faith" here in this religious experience is the same that will be found appearing later in the case of certain remarkable cures of disease. It seems to describe a state of mind, or rather of the whole being, in which the person exercising it reaches out to work with the unseen energy of God in penitent good will and to the utmost for the accomplishment of whatever God wishes to have done.

As Jesus talked with the man about the forgiveness of his sins, on which the man's paralysis had given him time and occasion to reflect,[5] he felt the impulse to cure rising within him. What the exact nature of the disease was is of course not evident. It was something that kept the man from walking, but in response to the sudden definite summons to get up and carry his cot home, the man found energy released within him with which to do it. He made his way through the excited crowd to the street, joined his four happy friends outside and went home.

This was apparently the beginning of hostility to Jesus on the part of the scribes, some of whom were present.[6] Jesus' conduct furnished indication of irregularity and independence, of a possible assumption of superiority to tradition that might make him unmanageable and, because of his popularity, dangerous to religion. He was assuming

[4] Mk. V:30.

[5] Disease was sometimes thought to be punishment for sin, *cf.* Jn. IX:1.

[6] Lk. V:17 represents them to have gathered apparently by previous arrangement from all over Galilee, Judæa and Jerusalem.

an intimacy with God, an ability to speak for God, that seemed to them exceedingly irreverent. The feeling did not reach the point of open expression at the time, but Jesus is said to have recognized its existence and to have met it without flinching by proceeding to perform the cure which he felt himself empowered to undertake. He assured them that God was not displeased with him for speaking as he had about forgiveness of sins and that he felt sure God would show his endorsement of what had been said by empowering him to cure the man's paralysis. How the scribes answered this logic does not appear here, but we have a suggestion later of what they might have said.

In this statement Jesus is represented to have called himself "the Son of Man." As we have seen (p. 41) this seems to have been used as a Messianic title at least in certain circles. The many who may not have accepted the Son of Man conception of Messiahship would none the less recognise it as one of several Messianic titles. But Jesus is represented in the Gospels as wishing to conceal any Messianic consciousness that he may have had.[7] Therefore it does not seem possible that he should have used the title here. The Gospel makers may have placed it on his lips here by a chronological inadvertence, since it will appear to be the title that he later applied to himself in the privacy of the inner circle. None of the Gospels represents anyone present on this occasion to have thought of Jesus as the Messiah.[8] It is entirely possible that in the Aramaic speech which lies behind our Greek Gospels a phrase was used which would yield the meaning "man" as well as be the suggestion of the technical title "Son of Man." In that case Jesus' statement

[7] Mk. I:34, III:12, VIII:27.
[8] Mt. IX:8, Mk. II:12, Lk. V:26.

here was that man could forgive sins on earth, which he proceeded to prove in the manner narrated here. The Matthew Gospel represents this to have been what the people understood him to mean: "They glorified God who had given such authority unto men." [9] In that case this would be another expression of Jesus' confidence that all his powers were prophetic of powers that men in the New Age would possess. The Matthew Gospel further represents him to have assured his disciples that they would all have a somewhat similar power, namely, the power of authoritative teaching: "Whatsoever things ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven." [10] In the Fourth Gospel Jesus is represented as expressly saying: "Whosoever sins ye forgive they are forgiven unto them." [11]

The second picture which the oldest Gospel draws to show the growing hostility of the scribes to Jesus reveals him in intimate social relations with those called "publicans and sinners." [12] These classes have already been briefly described (p. 37). Jesus made the acquaintance of a tax collector named Levi (Matthew in the Matthew Gospel) on the "sea shore." The audiences which he with some regularity "taught" had outgrown the house court where the last paragraph represented them to be meeting and he had found some available outdoor place near the busy life of the lake front. This brought him into the vicinity of the collector's office, situated perhaps on the great road running from Damascus to the Mediterranean. An acquaintance with the official developed, and Jesus found him to be the kind of man he could use in his

[9] Mt. IX:8.

[10] Mt. XVIII:18.

[11] Jn. XX:23; Paul believed that the Christians would share Jesus' power to judge the world and even angels, I Cor. VI:1-2.

[12] Mk. II:13-17.

propaganda throughout the province. He extended to him the same sort of invitation he had previously given the four fish dealers. It involved resigning or selling out his commission as collector.

The man evidently felt highly honored by receiving such an invitation from a distinguished religious leader. It was treatment utterly different from that usually accorded him by religious people. He closed up his business and accepted. He celebrated the event by giving a large dinner party, or "reception" as it is called in Luke's Gospel, to which he invited many of his own class, large numbers of whom had been attracted to the addresses Jesus had been giving on the lake front. They would have felt conspicuous if after long absence they had reappeared in the synagogue service to hear him, but they had experienced no such embarrassment in the outdoor meeting.

This dinner was attended also by many of the respectable classes, who had been regular attendants on Jesus' meetings so long that they were coming to be regarded as "disciples." It was an occasion on which they all ate together. This was a serious matter because eating together implied personal friendship. Furthermore a publican's or a "sinner's" table food, especially meat, would probably not have been prepared in accordance with the requirements of Moses' law as interpreted by the scribes. The guests too would have come freshly from contact with foreigners in all sorts of business relations. There would have been nothing of the procedure followed in a respectable Pharisee's home before meals, the careful bathing after coming from the market place, the "washing of cups, pots and brasen vessels." [13] From the standpoint of the Pharisee Jesus, who purported to be so re-

[13] Mk. VII:3-4.

ligious and so solicitous about preparing people for the Judgment Day, was actually corrupting the morals of his followers and fitting them for damnation in the great day. The Pharisaic Messianist, like Rabbi Saul later, felt that the hope of securing a law-keeping nation, and so preparing the way for the coming of the Messiah and his Kingdom, depended on separating the people from the evil influences pressing in on the nation from every side. To find the prophet Jesus lax at this vital point was exceedingly disturbing. They went to his "disciples," those whose morals were being directly corrupted by him, and tried to get them out from under his influence: "They said unto his disciples, How is it that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners?"

Jesus' view of the case was entirely different. What seemed to the Pharisees irreligious conduct seemed to him to be truly religious. He felt that he was succeeding in reaching those whom God wished him to prepare for the Judgment Day. The Pharisees were up to this point, so far as he had reason to suppose, respectably righteous. His chief business was with those who were evidently not righteous, publicans and sinners. He was like a surgeon on the battlefield after a battle, concerned only with the wounded. The Pharisees probably would not have objected to this view of the case. Their objection was to his method of procedure. They would have been glad to have publicans and sinners reform, but to try to secure this result by social friendship with them seemed absolutely wrong and irreligious. Jesus, who in all his intercourse with this class felt the life of God within him, judged that God was on terms of social intimacy with publicans and sinners. Perhaps Jesus to some extent learned this from experience. He saw how quickly recoverable such persons as Levi were through friendly

approach. From what seemed to be the wreckage of a human life he saw something rise up with a glad sense of opportunity and strong moral ambition at the unostentatious coming of a righteous friend.

CHAPTER XI

JESUS' CONFLICT WITH THE SCRIBES (*Continued*): FASTS AND THE SABBATH

AS time passed it became more and more evident to the scribes that Jesus was moving away from their idea of religion to one so different that it seemed to them actively irreligious. It seems necessary to suppose that Jesus' conduct had not always been what it was now becoming. If he had always been lax on the points brought up in this series of incidents the critical spirit of the scribes would have appeared earlier. Jesus' new responsibility for religious leadership may have forced upon him the necessity of deciding at what points he would endorse, and at what points he would ignore or oppose, the rules of conduct prescribed by the rabbis in their interpretation of the law.

The third step in the growing antagonism was taken in connection with fasting.[1] Fasting seemed to the scribes to be such a penitent expression of humility and guilt as would hasten the Messiah's coming to bring in the Kingdom of God. Mondays and Thursdays [2] were agreed upon as days when men might fast with the wholesome consciousness that many others were associated with them in the act. Perhaps some extremely pious persons fasted every week on these days, like the Pharisee in Luke's

[1] Mk. II:18-22.
[2] Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, ch. VIII.

Gospel [3] who said: "I fast twice in the week." It had seemed to John the Baptist that the practice was very suitable for the days just before the Judgment. But Jesus was notorious for his neglect of this custom. His disciples, especially among the publicans and sinners, were as apt to have dinner parties on Mondays and Thursdays as on other days. Finally John's disciples united with the Pharisees in a definite protest made to Jesus himself. How could one who purported to be preparing the nation for the coming Kingdom neglect this fundamental religious practice! Jesus defended himself by saying that fasting on the part of his disciples was utterly unsuitable to the circumstances in which they were living, as unsuitable as it would be for the near friends of a bridegroom to fast during the wedding days. During this week, when all sorts of feasting, sports and entertainments were being arranged, it would be utterly absurd for the principal entertainers to fast! The apparently obvious inference from this illustration was that Jesus considered himself to be the central figure in a situation made joyous by his presence for all connected with him. He had the glad sense of being appointed by God to leadership in the most inspiring enterprise that the Jewish mind could conceive; he was able to go about expelling demons, curing the sick, everywhere bringing gladness and hope. Under such circumstances how could his disciples fast! It would wreck their religious experience to try to express the tumultuous joy that filled their hearts by somber fasting. It would be as disastrously incongruous as it would be to put a patch of unshrunk flannel on an old well shrunk flannel garment. The garment would be ruined in the first washing. This illustration appealed to the women in his audiences (he probably discussed this well

[3] XVIII:12.

known criticism publicly and on a number of occasions). Another illustration appealed to farmers. It would be like putting fresh unfermented wine into old wine skins already stretched to the limit. When fermentation began the wine skins and their contents would be a total loss.[4]

Jesus is represented to have implied that fasting would not always be so disastrous, that he, perhaps like John the Baptist, would be either imprisoned or executed, and that then fasting would be in order, for his disciples as it was now for the disciples of John: "There will come days when the bridegroom will be taken from them; then will they fast in that day." It is not impossible that this prediction was inserted here by the compiler of the Gospel, as in accord with the expectation of death characteristic of Jesus' later teaching. If not, then there was even now a foreboding of trouble ahead in the heart of Jesus. Such a foreboding may have been one of the things that made it difficult for him to see just what was involved in his clear sense of leadership and that perhaps made him unwilling to adopt definitely any of the current ideas of Messiahship. He perhaps was waiting for God to make the future clearer to him.

The next step in the developing antagonism between Jesus and the scribes was regarding a point that seemed to the Pharisees to be very vital, the keeping of the Sabbath. All the laws, to be sure, were of vital importance, for they were all the gift of God from heaven, described the life of heaven (God himself had stopped his work and "rested" on the seventh day), and prescribed the sort

[4] Lk. V:36-39 varies the illustration of the patch in such a way as to emphasize still more both incongruousness and destruction. Two garments are ruined and the two kinds of cloth do not harmonize. He also adds a sentence which apologizes for the preference which John's disciples feel for the old custom of fasting: "anyone likes old wine better than new!"

of life on earth that would make men fit for, and able to feel at home in, the Kingdom of Heaven. It was easy to see, however, that the immediate consequences of disobedience were more serious in the case of some laws than in the case of others. Disobedience to the food laws, for instance, broke down the barrier between the social life of Jews and foreigners and so led easily to intermarriage and to all the consequent contagion of pagan religion. Disobedience to the Sabbath law also led easily to freer intercourse with, and contamination from, foreigners. Jewish idleness on every seventh day marked the Jew as peculiar and often made him unpopular among foreigners.[5] He could not be found at his place of business on that day, nor among other workmen, however much his employer might need his services. But more important than this social isolation secured by Sabbath keeping was the fact that a whole day was secured each week for the study of the law in the synagogue and at home. This most of all tended to keep the Jews' religious life free from all the evil foreign influences about it. It is not strange, therefore, that the scribes exerted themselves to the utmost to imagine all sorts of situations that might arise in the life of the people and to explain, with what seems to us absurd attention to detail, exactly how the Sabbath law applied to each. It was sometimes felt that if only two successive Sabbaths were kept by the nation, just as the scribes directed, it would bring national redemption.[6] Therefore, when Jesus was discovered to be out of sympathy with the effort of the scribes to enforce Sabbath keeping, he naturally seemed to them to be a most serious menace to religion.

In the oldest Gospel two cases of conflict over this point

[5] Juvenal, *Sat.* XIV.

[6] Weber, *Die Lehren des Talmud*, p. 334, quoting Sabbath Tract.

are described[7] which resulted in the determination of the Pharisees to bring formal charges against Jesus in the proper court and, if possible, to secure a death sentence.[8]

Before considering these two cases in detail, the exact point at issue between Jesus and the scribes should be noted. The scribes held that only what was absolutely necessary for the preservation of life, or the prevention of great suffering, or the avoidance of extreme inconvenience, should be done on the Sabbath. Whatever could be done on some other day should be put off. Jesus on the other hand held that whatever contributed to the real welfare of men might be done on the Sabbath and need not be postponed until the next day. This exact issue comes out clearly in a scene described by Luke.[9] A woman who for eighteen years had not been able to stand erect appeared in the synagogue on the Sabbath and was cured by Jesus. The ruler of the synagogue became very indignant because Jesus had not waited a day. He stated his case with great force to the audience: "The ruler of the synagogue being moved with indignation because Jesus had healed on the Sabbath answered and said to the multitude. There are six days in which men ought to work; in them, therefore, come and be healed and not on the day of the Sabbath." Jesus' retort was that they were more merciful to their live stock than they were to human beings. They did not make a thirsty ox wait for water until the Sabbath was over; why should they make this "daughter of Abraham" wait for healing?

This is the point at issue in the two typical cases cited

[7] Mk. II:23-III:6.

[8] Mk. III:6.

[9] Lk. XIII:10-17. See I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, pp. 129-135.

by Mark. In the first one while Jesus and a group of his disciples were passing by a grain field, some of his disciples, who were hungry, "harvested" and "threshed" a few handfuls of grain which Jesus and his disciples ate. This seemed to certain Pharisees, who either saw it or heard of it, to be a clear case of Sabbath breaking. When they called Jesus to account for letting his disciples set such an example to the people, he defended himself by citing what David had allowed his young men to do when they were hungry, namely break the law regarding the use of holy tabernacle bread. A company of them under his leadership, setting out suddenly on an expedition that need not be described here, appeared at the tabernacle and asked the high priest for bread. He had only Jehovah's sacred bread—priests' food according to the law—but he gave it to them at David's request. Neither David's young men nor Jesus' disciples were in desperate need. Both groups were hungry but they could have gone hungry for hours without running any serious risk, and could presumably have secured food in some other way within a short time. Jesus' point seems to be that David interpreted the priests' bread law in a rather common sense way, which made it justifiable to use the bread for other persons when to do so would help a worthy cause. Jesus assumed that the situation in which he was leading a company of young men about, authoritatively proclaiming the nearness of the Kingdom of God, was, to say the least, as important as that in which David found himself. This comparison of the two situations made it natural later for the Gospel makers to see here a covert comparison between David, who was to be the Lord's anointed King, and Jesus, the Messianic Lord's Anointed. The Matthew Gospel attributes to Jesus another comparison, particularly effective with Palestinian Jews. The priests carry

burdens and do other work on the Sabbath which it would be unlawful for other men to do, but which is lawful for them because done in the service of the temple. Then follows the statement that "something [10] greater than the temple is here." This means that the situation created by Jesus, in which his disciples were employed, was greater than the temple. The sentence added in all three Gospels, "and so Lord is the Son of Man even of the Sabbath," may be an explanatory sentence that originated with the early expounders of Jesus' teaching. If it came from Jesus himself it is not in its original form, for, at a time when he was careful not to express a Messianic consciousness, he would not have publicly called himself by the Messianic title "Son of Man." As was said (p. 102) regarding the occurrence of this title in Mk. II:12, the phrase in Aramaic might have meant "man," in which case the meaning would be that man, enlightened and spiritualized man in the New Age, would have authority to use the Sabbath as he should see fit. This accords well with the sentence just preceding it, found in Mark only, which says that "the Sabbath was made for man." This latter sentence is also found in the early tradition of the scribes,[11] although their extreme exaltation of the law made it also easy to think of the creation of man as a result of God's desire to have someone to obey his Sabbath law.

The second case cited by Mark is a synagogue scene. A workman with a "withered" hand, and so in danger of becoming a pauper, was present. A fragment of the lost Gospel according to the Hebrews, represents him to have been a mason of independent spirit and to have said to Jesus: "I was a mason seeking my living by my

[10] Not "some *one*," see R.V. margin.
[11] Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, p. 129.

hands. I beseech thee, Jesus, to restore health to me that I may not wretchedly beg for my food." Jesus, himself a workman, knew what a terrible disaster the loss of a hand was. There were scribes present also, apparently already aroused by Jesus' previous conduct on the Sabbath, and expecting that something would happen in this service which would be ground for a formal charge against him. Jesus accepted the challenge of the situation. It was another chance, like the cure of the paralytic to make the healing of disease contribute to, rather than interfere with, the success of his teaching about the nature of true righteousness, true fitness for the Judgment Day and the life of the New Age. He asked the man to stand up. Then, turning to the scribes in the "chief seats," he asked them with something of irony whether it was "lawful" on the Sabbath to do such good as he was proposing to do to this man or such harm as they were planning in their hearts to do to himself, to save this man's life by fitting him to earn his living again or to destroy life as they were planning to destroy his own life. They were silent. For a moment he looked at them man by man with rising "anger," pained by their hard hearted indifference to the crippled workman's condition. Meanwhile in the crippled man who stood waiting, expectation, or "faith," rose to its height and when Jesus spoke the sharp incisive word, "Put out your hand!" something within him was released and his hand was again responsive to his will.

The climax had come. The scribes went out to prepare formal charges against Jesus which would lead to his execution. They tried to enlist the so-called Herod party. Who "the Herodians" were is not clear. Presumably they were an organization of those upon whose assistance Herod relied in his vigilant effort to keep his territory in

order and so to keep himself in favor with the Roman authorities. If so, the scribes must have represented that the great popularity of Jesus made him politically dangerous. Nothing seems to have to have resulted from this effort at the time. Herod already had one popular prophet in prison, John the Baptist, and he probably thought it inexpedient to lay hands on another just then. This was a movement on the part of the local Capernaum or Galilean scribes and not so serious as the movement of larger dimensions later among the Jerusalem scribes.

CHAPTER XII

JESUS' CONFLICT WITH THE SCRIBES (*Concluded*):

VERDICT OF THE JERUSALEM SCRIBES AND JESUS' ATTACK ON THE TRADITION

ALTHOUGH the purpose of the Galilean scribes to prosecute Jesus was not carried out, their opposition probably prejudiced the very conservative element of the synagogue constituency against him. After this time he is never, in Mark's Gospel, found in a synagogue except once in Nazareth. This may be simply because Mark had no more occasion to mention synagogues, or it may be that by an understanding among the synagogue rulers of Galilee platform privileges were to be thereafter denied to Jesus. In any case he was still a popular hero. The statement that the scribes were planning his prosecution is significantly followed in Mark's Gospel by a vivid picture of a scene on the lake front.[1] Men and women from all over Palestine were there, from Sidon in the north to Idumæa in the south, and from east of the Jordan. There was almost a panic. Demoniacs were shrieking; an excited crowd of men and women were pushing and fighting for a chance to have their sick touch him, or to get near enough to see a healing. Jesus was in danger of being thrown down and

[1] III:6-12.

trampled on. In self-defense he had a boat kept close to the shore so that he might wade out to it and escape: "He spoke to his disciples that a little boat should wait on him because of the crowd lest they should throng him." The scene shows why he was so unwilling to have the healing of disease become prominent.

About this time Jesus did something which must have aroused intense suspicion among the scribes if they knew of it.[2] Mark seems to imply a degree of secrecy in the procedure. Jesus sent personal invitations to a number of his followers, asking them to meet him at a designated place in the Galilean hill country: "He goeth up into the mountain and calleth to him whom he himself would." Out of this number he selected twelve men. The Luke Gospel says that the night before he announced the names of those selected was spent in prayer.[3] He may have been deciding whether to take this step, or may have been going over the list of names, asking for guidance in choosing between those who seemed equally eligible. These twelve were to be with him more constantly than the main body of his disciples could be, were to be sent out to proclaim everywhere the nearness of the Coming Kingdom, to describe the sort of righteousness that would be preparation for its Judgment Day and to expel demons. The number twelve would have seemed to the scribes a suspicious number. When the New Age should come it was expected by many, especially by those looking for "the Son of David," that the old twelve tribe organization of the nation would be restored. The Matthew Gospel represents Jesus to have said later to the twelve that each of them was to be in charge of a tribe in "the regeneration."[4]

[2] Mk. III:13-19.
[3] Lk. VI:12.
[4] Mt. XIX:28, *cf.* Lk. XXII:30.

The scribes may have been led by this step to wonder whether Jesus' popularity might be tempting him to have Messianic ambitions. Such action would not necessarily indicate this. Elijah or some other of the great prophets who were expected to return and prepare the nation for the New Age might have done this.

The Galilean scribes, greatly disturbed by the unabating popularity of Jesus, and perhaps also by his selection of twelve men, sent to Jerusalem for re-enforcement from the great scribes of the city. These distinguished scribes tried to check the rising tide of Jesus' popularity by publishing an official verdict upon his career, which was calculated to make all men draw away from him in horror. The phenomenon they had to explain was, as they would have put it, that a notoriously irreligious man, deceiving the people by pretending to be a prophet of God, had unusual power to expel demons and cure the sick. Their explanation was that he got his power from Satan. Demons obeyed him because he was a superior devil.[5] He was a high arch-devil commissioned by Satan to deceive the people and defeat God's purpose to set up his Kingdom. The natural effect of such a verdict would be to make men, women and children avoid him. It would be unsafe for a man to stop on the edge of a crowd to which Jesus was talking because Jesus' evil eye might rest upon him and bring a curse.

To make matters still worse for Jesus just about this time his family appeared from Nazareth and, probably unconsciously, played into the hands of the Jerusalem scribes. The oldest Gospel brings out the fact that Jesus, just before the scribes came from Jerusalem with their verdict, had aroused unusual interest in his teaching.

[5] Mk. III:22.

Crowds came to hear it with such interest that neither he nor they stopped to eat. The multitudes came together again "so that they could not so much as eat bread." When the family in Nazareth heard of the intense abandon with which Jesus was giving himself to his teaching they reached the conclusion that he had lost his mental balance.[6] They were probably also disturbed by his unfortunate collisions with the scribes, for Jesus' brother James appears in early Christian history as a Christian of Pharisaic devotion to the law. They came down to Capernaum probably intending to take Jesus back to Nazareth with the expectation that rest and seclusion would quiet his nerves. Perhaps also they feared that the ill will of the powerful scribes might bring danger to them as well as to Jesus. The Mark Gospel pictures their arrival at the house where Jesus was teaching and his resentment at their interference.[7]

Jesus was deeply moved by the verdict of the Jerusalem scribes for he had really been tempted to make a temporary alliance with Satan in order to gain just such power as he was now able to exercise but had fought the temptation down.[8] He arranged a meeting with them in which he publicly discussed their verdict.[9] He said that their theory was absurd. It implied the existence of factions in Satan's empire, one part trying to possess and destroy the bodies of men, the other trying to save them. It was like a kingdom divided into factions and therefore sure to fall, or like a family (his own family?) divided and sure to fall. An illustration of what actually had happened, he said, was the case of a person who enters a

[6] Mk. III:20-21.
[7] Mk. III:31-35.
[8] Mt. IV:7-10, see p. 78.
[9] Mk. III:23-30.

strong man's castle, ties the strong man up, and then proceeds to do what he likes with the strong man's belongings. He evidently meant that he had himself struggled with Satan, beaten and bound him and was now able to do what he liked with Satan's subjects. He felt the triumphant consciousness of being empowered by God for leadership in that Kingdom which would banish Satan and all his subjects from the earth. Then he turned upon the dignified scholars with a terrible note of warning. As has been said before (p. 86), he reverenced profoundly the sacred power that was rising up within him, pouring out through him life, health and spiritual truth, at times urging him forward, at times holding him back—the Holy Spirit, the Spirit that would dominate the radiant life of the New Age. Anyone who now, in the very dawning of the Judgment Day, could face this highest, holiest manifestation of the mercifully out-breaking heavens and see in it only a manifestation of hell was in danger of a fixed moral perversity that would stumble hopelessly on into the outer darkness. Such persons were in danger of an "eternal sin." Verse 30 is the compiler's comment: "because they said he hath an unclean spirit." Perhaps the Jews of the compiler's day were still saying this about Jesus. This passage may also express the opinion held by many Gentile Christians in Paul's day, namely, that there was no hope for the Jewish nation. God had forever cast them off.[10]

Jesus' answer to the verdict of the Jerusalem scribes seems to have satisfied the Galilean public, for his popularity continued without abatement. In the next chapters the evidences of this will be noted. The present discussion of his conflict with the Galilean scribes may be brought to a close by anticipating the final clash with them which

[10] *Cf.* Rom. XI:1,

led him to withdraw from Galilee. This clash was over the "tradition of the elders" [11] and must have seemed to the scribes most fundamental of all. The vigor of Jesus' language in the controversy shows that his feeling had been intensified by their blasphemous attack on his Inner Spirit and by their determination to have him arrested. It is still the Jerusalem scribes that are re-enforcing the local Galilean Pharisees.[12] They see or hear that some of Jesus' disciples disregard the traditional explanation of the law by not carefully washing their hands before eating. From the standpoint of the scribes such washing was necessary because a person before coming to the table might have touched some defiling object. Especially if he had recently been in the market he might have touched with his hands some person or thing connected with pagan worship. Since knives, forks and spoons were not in use and food was put into the mouth with the hands, any defilement would be communicated to the food and so pass into the system. What so passed into a man's system was thought to affect his spirit. Therefore it was thought to be exceedingly important that, before handling food at table, the hands be washed in particular ways minutely specified.

When the scribes called Jesus to account for tolerating the laxity of some of his disciples in this matter, he suddenly blazed out in vehement attack on the whole system of "tradition" [13] in which the regulation regarding hand-washing was one item: "Isaiah gave a beautifully exact description of you hypocrites when he said, 'this people honors me with their lips but their heart is far from me; it is in vain that they worship me while teaching

[11] Mk. VII:1-24.
[12] Mk. VII:1.
[13] On "tradition" see p. 32.

as teachings (mere) commandments of men.'[14] You are abandoning the commandment of God and holding on to the tradition of men." Jesus then proceeded to specify a particular instance of conflict between the law and the scribes' traditional amplification of the law. It may have been a case that had come under his observation either recently or earlier in Nazareth. The law commanded that honor be shown to parents. The tradition said that a man might take a vow making all of his estate a gift to God ("Korban" is an Aramaic word meaning "gift") so far as the support of his father was concerned, though not in fact parting with any of his property. After such a vow the tradition forbade his contributing anything to his father's support even if he should repent his merciless vow. Jesus said that there were many similar cases of outrageous conflict between tradition and law. It is possible to show from the Talmud that there were scribes who agreed with Jesus that no vow should interfere with the honor due to parents.[15] It may still be true, however, that the scribes who came into collision with Jesus were of a different sort.

After this indignant outbreak against the scribes Jesus proceeded to do a daring thing. He called the crowds about him and made a public attack on the traditional teaching regarding food laws. He said that no foods entering the stomach could defile the spirit. It was not food going in through the mouth into the stomach that produced moral defilement, but evil words coming out through the mouth from a foul heart! This was a sweep-

[14] The quotation from Isaiah is from the Greek translation of the Old Testament. The Hebrew contains a less appropriate thought. It may be that the strong feeling of the church against the synagogue in the Gospel maker's time has somewhat shaped the details of this discussion.

[15] Montefiore, *Synoptic Gospels*, pp. 164-5.

ing utterance apparently annulling not only the tradition but the dietary law itself. Just how much Jesus meant by it was not clear to the early Christians. As we have seen (p. 14) the Matthew Gospel says that he was talking only about the scribal tradition regarding hand washing, while Mark's Gospel says that he here abrogated the Levitical food law itself.[16]

In any case, this sharp clash between Jesus and the Galilean Pharisees re-enforced by great scholars from Jerusalem terminated Jesus' work in Galilee, at least for the time being. He made a long journey into the country north of Galilee, the regions of Tyre and Sidon, and tried to find obscure lodgings where his presence would not be noticed.[17]

The fundamental difference between Jesus and the scribes, as revealed in all these incidents, was in their idea of God and what he wanted of men. Jesus brought into the situation a fresh and profound experience with God. He knew himself to be a son of God living in conscious fellowship with God; he knew himself to be "The Son of God, the Beloved" charged with the responsibility of leadership in the Kingdom of God, though what form this leadership would assume he may have learned only as time went on. In his new experience with God he found God not to be selfishly reserving to himself the glad experience of forgiving sin. It was not true, as the scribes asserted, that God only could forgive sins. Jesus found God thrusting him out to forgive sins with the expectation that all men could be trained to feel God in them forgiving the sins of penitent men. God was not holding himself aloof from bad men, as the scribes supposed. Jesus found God pushing him out into friendly social relations with

[16] Mt. XV:20, Mk. VII:19.
[17] Mk. VII:24.

publicans and sinners. God took no delight in the gloomy fastings that the scribes were urging upon the home life of working men and women and their children in the community. He found the life of God welling up within him and overflowing in wholesome gladness at every turn. He found that God was not wanting his Sabbath to be kept with painful abstinence from a multitude of activities. God was pushing him out to go everywhere doing good on the Sabbath, doing whatever he could to meet the needs of men in the larger leisure from regular work to be enjoyed on the Sabbath. God did not go about the family table making a close inspection of hands to see whether there was evidence that some ungodly fellow being had been touched! He listened rather to the table talk to see whether it came from hearts that were true and friendly or mean and spiteful. In a word, God was a Heavenly Father in the midst of human children, not a mere lawgiver, bookkeeper and detective.

In connection with all these points this question constantly arises: Why did the scribes not see that Jesus' idea of God and true religion was better than their own? The sad story of our own prejudices gives a partial answer. We are all slow to modify hereditary religious ideas which often have the associations of childhood knit up with them, especially when we have maintained them at considerable cost in the face of opposition. Doubtless many scribes did recognize the superiority of Jesus' views and quietly dropped out of the ranks of active antagonists. Regarding the residuum, who constituted the powerful "machine" element, Jesus finally uttered a searching criticism. He said that they were wedded to the views of which they were everywhere recognized as the distinguished champions, because such recognition brought them a large measure of social prestige. It brought them defer-

ential greetings in the market places, the most honorable seats in the synagogues and at dinner parties.[18] They probably retorted that Jesus advocated his "loose views" because of the popularity he gained by doing so! Jesus was finally tested at this point, and stood the test.

[18] Mk. XII:38-39.

CHAPTER XIII

FOUR WONDERFUL WORKS: THE POWER OF FAITH

DURING all the period of Jesus' conflict with the Pharisees, described in the last two chapters, his popularity in Galilee had been increasing. Mark's Gospel records a group of four "mighty works," [1] all occurring within twenty-four hours, that illustrate Jesus' power and that partly account for his great reputation among the people. At the later time, when the Gospels were forming and Jesus' Messiahship was a recognized fact, these four mighty works naturally seemed to be incidents in the triumphal progress of the Son of God as he passed in fulness of power through the dark earth-realm of Satan. He stood up in a boat on the Sea of Galilee in the midst of a storm and subdued the fierce storm-spirit by a word of rebuke; as soon as he came to land he sent a legion of demons out of a demoniac into a herd of swine that straightway fled from his presence into the sea; the next day when he came back to the other side of the sea a desperate woman in the crowded street was cured by simply touching the fringe of his garment; a few moments later he stood by the bedside of a dead child and overcame death itself. All of these phenomena, the destructive storm, the fierce horde of demons, the desolating sickness, death itself, belonged, according to popu-

[1] Mk. IV:35-V:43.

lar thought, in Satan's dark realm which the Son of God had come to overthrow by bringing in the Reign of God. These wonderful deeds did not, however, at the time of their occurrence convince the people that Jesus was the Messiah. He seemed to them to be only a great prophet of God. If we are to get at their real meaning in terms of our own thought world it is necessary to inquire what actually happened in each case and what the religious experience of Jesus was in each.

The experience in the storm occurred in the late afternoon of a day when Jesus, sitting in a boat a few rods out from the shore, had been talking to great crowds on the lake front. He evidently found himself tired out and asked the few disciples, who were with him in the boat, to go directly across to the other side of the lake for a night's rest away from the crowds. A flotilla of other little fishing boats full of people listening to his teaching had gathered around his boat. Some of these boats perhaps also started across the lake. Jesus immediately stretched himself out on a seat in the stern of the boat, with his head on a cushion or wooden head rest, and at once fell into a sound sleep. When they were well out in the lake (some five or six miles across at this point) one of the fierce storms, frequent then as now, suddenly came down upon them. The day had been hot and the heated air over the surface of the lake low down among the hills, rising rapidly, let in tremendous currents of colder air coming down the valleys from the northern mountains. The boat soon began to fill with water, but neither the wetness of his clothes, the motion of the boat, the roaring of the wind, nor the shouting of the men disturbed Jesus' sound sleep. The disciples roused him and said with some impatience according to Mark: "Teacher, does it make no difference to you that we are

being lost?" (Mt., "Lord save us, we are being lost!" Lk., "Master, Master, we are being lost!") As soon as he was thoroughly awake, "he rebuked the wind and said to the sea, 'Silence; be still!'" The wind died away and there was a complete calm. What Jesus then said to his disciples shows that the uppermost thought in his mind was "faith." "Why are you so frightened," he said, "have you no faith yet?" What did he mean by "faith"? In general "faith in God," as Jesus used the expression, is the reaching out of the soul to work with the unseen energy of God in good will and at any cost for the common good. To have faith in a man is to have such confidence in his ability and character, either present or potential, as leads one to wish to work with him for the common good. In this experience on the lake Jesus had consciousness of being chosen by God to introduce the New Age for man. In faith he had given himself to God to do this great work at any cost. Such faith enabled him to sleep soundly through all the uproar of the storm. God, the Heavenly Father, whose living will had risen high and powerful in his soul, would not let anything happen that would defeat the great purpose. Jesus felt that his disciples ought by this time to be sharing his own faith in God, and in himself as the one who was leading the way into the New Age. Very possibly he had been talking with unusual force to the crowds that afternoon about having faith in the Heavenly Father. The disciples seemed not to get his point. They said to each other, "Who then is this that even the wind and the sea obey him?" This remark does not indicate complete ignorance of Jesus' mission as the great prophet who leads the way into the New Age, but it does show them to have had no idea that such a prophet would have power over storms. It probably also shows that they did not yet see in him,

as they did later, one who was more than a great prophet-leader.

We naturally ask, What actually happened in the boat on the lake? What connection was there between the personality of Jesus and the sudden change in the weather? It is often said that there was none, that Jesus' quieting faith in God was the impressive fact, that the storm happened to die away just when it did, and that what goes beyond this in the narrative as it stands was the sincere interpretation of the incident made by the early Christians, who thought they knew how the Messiah must have acted under such circumstances. If we follow the hints given by Jesus regarding his experience in the healing of disease (p. 85), we should naturally say that Jesus prayed to God in the storm and received instant assurance of safety. Whatever he really said was an expression of this assurance. But could the will of God affect the weather? We are learning that the "forces of nature," by virtue of their reliable habits of action, their "fixed laws," are extremely susceptible to the manipulation of personal human wills, acting always, to be sure, through apparatus, but often a diminishing amount of apparatus. Such manipulation of them has produced much that is most wonderful in our modern civilization. This field has been given over to man for his conquest. He would not wish for any intervention by God that would take away from him the joy of independent achievement. At the same time it is not inconceivable that the mysterious will of God should under certain circumstances co-ordinate some of these forces in response to prayer. The line between "spiritual" and "physical" energy does not seem so clear as it once did.

When Jesus' boat came to the eastern shore after the storm it was evening. At some distance from the lake

V: 6), a demoniac stood in the door of one of the burial chambers, cut out in the rocky hillside, and watched the boat draw near the shore. His family had kept him at home in the city as long as possible, but the violence of his terrible frenzy was such that no chains or fetters could hold him and they had to let him run wild. The devils had so utterly befouled him that he lived permanently in the defilement of a tomb chamber, always a favorite resort for demons. He was in the habit of ranging up and down the hillsides, yelling and attacking man and beast. His dirty naked body was covered with scars where he had gashed it with stones. His unusual strength and fierceness had made people say that a crowd of devils had entered his body. He considered the name of the pack to be "Legion." When he saw that the group of men had landed he rushed down the hillside to attack them, but as soon as he came into the presence of Jesus he salaamed before him. Jesus, as usual, ordered the evil spirit to come out of him. The excited demon, calling Jesus by his title, "Son of God Most High," shouted out a protest against being sent to torment before the Judgment Day.

The psychological explanation of the behavior of demoniacs in the presence of Jesus has been discussed (p. 87). If any importance is to be attached to a possible telepathic connection, mentioned in that discussion, between the mind of Jesus and the disordered mind of a demoniac, there would be particular significance in the fact that Jesus came to this interview just after his experience in the storm in which the sense of God's presence had been particularly strong in him. This man's case differed from those previously discussed in the fact that he was not living in a place where Jesus' reputation as an exorcist and his preaching about the Judgment Day were being talked about on every side. It is, of course,

not impossible that those who used this story in the early preaching of the pre-Gospel period put into this narrative what they knew to have been the usual conversation between Jesus and the demoniacs. But it may be that this man, in the earlier stages of his disease, when he was still with his family, had heard much about Jesus or even seen him. Jesus was famous in the region east of the Jordan [2] and may have occasionally visited it. We know that he did visit it later.[3] Jesus asked the demon what his name was. It is often said that he asked the man to tell him his name, with the purpose of bringing the man back to normal consciousness. This probably reads into the story too much of the modern psychological viewpoint. The story comes to us in popular folk lore form, and from this standpoint it would be natural to think that Jesus' power compelled the demon to reveal his name and so to put himself under the control of the one who had discovered it. The man, speaking for the terrified demons within him, revealed the secret: "Legion is my name." The man knew how his "Legion" dreaded a return to a bodiless state in which they would have no instrument through which to gratify their fierce lust to destroy. He saw a large drove of hogs near by, which he had perhaps often stampeded. He knew that the drove of devils would be glad to get into them and work destruction there. He begged that they might do so and, when permission was given, perhaps started toward the drove with the imagined rush of the demons in that direction. The frightened animals, stampeded by him more than once before, rushed down the hillside and were piled upon the shore and in the water dead.

The disciples doubtless washed the man's wounds, pro-

[2] Mk. III:8.
[3] Mk. VII:31.

vided him with clothing and rejoiced with him over the great deliverance that Jesus had wrought for him. He was much interested in the account given him during the evening of what Jesus and his disciples were preaching and doing on the Galilean side of the lake. He had every reason to believe that the Kingdom of God was near! In the morning, after a night of natural sleep, when Jesus started back he begged to be taken on as a member of the company. Jesus, however, insisted on his going back to his family to tell them what God had done for him. As we have seen, Jesus sometimes tried to avoid or to conceal the cure of disease, but he is never represented to have felt this desire in the case of the expulsion of demons. The man went all through the Ten City District, telling what had happened to him and probably saying much about the nearness of the Kingdom of God which had so frightened his Legion.

The swineherds had at once reported the occurrence in the city and the next morning great crowds came out to the place. They saw the wild man sane, clothed, sitting quietly listening to Jesus' daily teaching. They also saw the dead hogs and felt that the man's restoration to the community had been accomplished at too great a cost. They urged Jesus to leave the country at once!

In the early forenoon Jesus returned to the western shore and found a large crowd gathered on the lake front waiting for him. The whole community was excited over the great trouble that had come to the home of a leading citizen, one of the synagogue rulers. His twelve year old daughter (Lk., his only daughter) was lying at the point of death and he was himself in the midst of the crowd nervously watching the approaching boat. As soon as Jesus landed the synagogue ruler, not content with the ordinary salaam, fell on the ground at his feet and begged

him most urgently to hurry home with him and save his little daughter's life by his healing hand. The synagogue rulers in Capernaum presumably sympathized with the scribes, who had before this determined to prosecute Jesus in the courts and who had probably urged upon all synagogue rulers his exclusion from the synagogue platform. This ruler's action, therefore, was in defiance of his class. He had not accepted the theory that Jesus was in league with Satan, and his desperate desire to save his little daughter was enough to make him go against his colleagues. Jesus at once started with him for the house. The whole crowd closed in about them and went along full of sympathy for the anxious father. As they were hurrying along Jesus suddenly stopped, turned around and said, "Who touched my clothes?" No one spoke and the disciples called his attention to the fact that many people were jostling against him. He kept peering about through the crowd until a trembling woman, frightened at the liberty she had taken, stepped out, dropped on her knees before him and told her sad story. She had for a long time been afflicted with continual menstrual hemorrhage, which made her ceremonially defiling to everyone who touched her.[4] She was a desperate, lonely woman. Her disease had doubtless caused her husband to divorce her, if she was a married woman, and it had made her presence in the general social life of the community an impossibility. She had contaminated those who had touched her in this crowd and some shrank back as they heard her confession. In her desperation she had spent everything she had on physicians, who had prescribed painful remedies, but had not helped her, and she was now in the worst stage of the disease. She had not dared to bring her case openly to Jesus, but she had

[4] Lev. XV:19-30.

felt sure that she would be cured if she could simply come near him and, without anyone knowing it, touch his garment, especially the tassel on his cloak (Mt., Lk.) that showed him to be a man who loved God's law. Perhaps too she thought that simply touching his clothing would not contaminate his person. So she had been on the lake front watching for his return and with suppressed eagerness had edged her way through the crowd until she got her chance. Instantly she had felt the consciousness of health. Jesus, too, according to the explanation of the Gospel writer (Lk., his own explanation) had a sensation which presumably was usual when he healed. He had felt "power go out from him." Jesus after hearing her story minimized his part in the cure. "It was your faith that cured you," he said, "go in peace and be a healthy woman from now on." Such cures are not unknown in modern therapeutics and might be psychologically explained by the word "faith," though not necessarily in the sense in which Jesus used the word. The faith of those who came to him was more than mere expectation of being cured. Jesus was recognized by them as a prophet of the New Age. They expected to be cured as a part of, or in preparation for, the healthy life of the New Age. Faith meant, therefore, setting their faces, more or less consciously, toward the life of God's New Age and its righteousness as the prophet was constantly describing it. Jesus, too, was so charged with the life of God that great tides of healthful psychic influence probably flowed out from his person to those who were in expectant spiritual touch with him. The Spirit of God was at this time kindling all his being in anticipation of what would soon be done for the little girl at the point of death. In these moments as he hastened along the street in prayerful spiritual communion with the Heavenly

Father, this woman's timid hand of confident faith was laid upon him.

This delay must have been almost intolerable to the synagogue ruler, who felt that every minute was precious. When he saw his servants pushing in through the crowd he knew that his worst fears were realized. They said, "It is of no use to trouble the Teacher; she is dead." But Jesus was not disturbed. He urged the ruler to maintain the same state of mind that he had just seen cure the woman, "Do not be afraid," he said, "only keep on having faith." If we follow Jesus' hint as to his procedure in curing disease (p. 85) we should infer that he had held this little girl up in a flash of prayer before God the moment he heard of her and had received instant assurance that she would live. In a few moments they reached the house. The mourners, for some hours in waiting to be ready the moment they were needed, had already begun the death wail. The house was full of confusion.[5] Jesus insisted that the crowd should remain in the street. He left his own disciples, except three who went in with him, to keep the crowd back. He told the mourners to keep quiet; the little girl was not yet dead, but only sleeping. This seemed to them a reflection on their professional skill and they scoffed at him. He insisted that they should all leave and then the six of them, father, mother, himself and his three disciples, went into the sick room together. Jesus very simply took the child's hand, and said in her Aramaic vernacular, "Get up, little girl." She instantly got up and began to walk about

[5] Matthew mentions flute players. Perhaps the piercing notes of the flute were not heard at funerals among the Gentile circles for which the Mark and Luke Gospels were prepared. According to the Talmud, even the poorest Israelite should have two flute players and one wailing woman at his wife's death. A synagogue president in the case of an only daughter would probably have more.

the room. Those who were with Jesus were astonished, but he minimized the occurrence. He told them to get her something to eat and with great emphasis warned them never to mention the matter. He knew that the report of what had happened might easily produce a state of mind among the people very unfavorable to the consideration of the moral responsibilities he was pressing upon them.

One other case of this kind is found in another of the first three Gospels,[6] but no details of the death are given. Jesus is reported to have stopped a funeral procession in which a widow's only son was being carried out of the city for burial. Jesus laid his hand on the open coffin and told the young man to get up. He at once sat up and began to speak to those about him. Jesus "gave him to his mother." How long he had been dead the narrative does not state. Perhaps it had been only a very short time. In the east burial follows death by only a few hours. Lieutenant Conder saw a boy killed by falling from a tree and buried within fifteen minutes.[7] Calling the spirit back into the body probably did not seem as wonderful to the Jewish mind as to us. According to the Talmud the spirit stayed about the body for three days after death, presumably hoping for a chance to get back.[8]

From the modern medical standpoint natural death is a process and not an instantaneous occurrence. Sometimes the process is thought not to have ended and resuscitative measures to be efficacious some hours after death

[6] Lk. VII:11-17.

[7] Conder, *Tent Work in Palestine*, p. 326.

[8] The case of Lazarus in the Fourth Gospel was thought to be hopeless because he had been dead four days. His sister supposed that decomposition would have begun but the narrative does not state that this was the case.

would have once seemed complete. The same power over susceptible minds that was used by Jesus in curing disease, might, it would seem, have been available to arrest the process of death and to keep the mind in connection with the body. In his experience the outstanding feature in such cases was faith, his own faith, and the faith of others immediately concerned. Here again faith involved the keen consciousness of the energy of the living God close at hand and the reaching out of the soul to work with it in good will and in great hope. The mind of the little girl had presumably been in sympathy with her father's purpose. She knew that he had gone out to bring the prophet of the New Age. She was expectant in her last conscious moments and susceptible to his influence, and she believed in the God of her father.

CHAPTER XIV

EXTENSION OF THE MOVEMENT IN GALILEE THROUGH TRAINED ASSISTANTS

JESUS, as soon as possible, shared his work in Galilee with trained assistants. In the oldest Gospel the account of his sending these men out is preceded by a paragraph describing the very disagreeable treatment received by him and his assistants in his home town.[1] Jesus is represented to have been much surprised by it: "he marvelled because of their unbelief." Perhaps what he discovered here led him to suspect that, in spite of his very great general popularity, there was among the people an element of opposition, an element that had been influenced by the hostile attitude of the scribes and perhaps by the leaders of the revolutionary party of Judas and Saddouk (p. 35), though not openly active against him. He knew well enough that there would be opposition in Jerusalem and Judæa but he might have hoped to get thorough possession of Galilee. This discovery of hostile sentiment in Nazareth may have led him at once to intensify his effort by sending out his assistants, although of course the mere juxtaposition of the two paragraphs in Mark is no proof of this.

Jesus came back to his home town a famous teacher, bringing with him a company of admiring "disciples," who were probably anticipating an enthusiastic welcome

[1] Mk. VI:1-6, 7-13.

for their Rabbi. He came back to the old home, the old shop, the old synagogue and school of his boyhood, back to the people for whom he had worked, to his mother, brothers and sisters, brothers-in-law, nephews and nieces. Everywhere he was coldly received. His brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law seemed supercilious; the children perhaps felt about their uncle as they found their parents feeling (p. 56). In his own language, he found himself a "prophet without honor," not only "in his own country" but even "among his own kin and in his own family." We have already seen that his family were out of sympathy with him. They had appeared at a most awkward moment in his public work, possessed of the idea that he had lost his mental balance and needed to be kept in seclusion at home until he should recover it.[2] They were probably still unhappy over the dignified repulse they had received then.

On the Sabbath, when Jesus spoke in the old synagogue, the audience was impressed by the tone of authority that characterized all his teaching,[3] but found it offensive. Why should one who had made their furniture and farm tools talk to them in this way! His family connections were no better than theirs! Very likely the great scholars were right in attributing his unusual power over demons to an alliance with Satan. His own family suspected his sanity. He always had been queer. It certainly had a bad look! "What is this wisdom that is given unto this man, and what mean such mighty works wrought by his hands? Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, and brother of James and Judas and Joses and Simon? And are not his sisters here with us? And they were offended in him." In support of their theory it

[2] Mk. III:20-21, 31-35, cf. *Jn.* VII:5.
[3] Mk. I:27.

turned out that "he could do there no mighty work." He was able simply to lay his hands upon a few sick folk among the old neighbors and heal them. The Nazareth people had found him out! They knew him better than the crowds that he had deluded!

The visit probably included at least two Sabbaths, on both of which he spoke in the synagogue. If so there would be place here for the account of a Nazareth visit found in Luke's Gospel with its characteristic emphasis on Jesus' graciousness of speech and winsome power over an audience.[4] According to this account Jesus began his address in the synagogue by reading from the Isaiah roll [5] a paragraph which he either selected himself or which was a part of the assigned scripture reading for the day: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor: He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord" (Lk., IV: 18-19).

Luke placed this great proclamation at the beginning of his account of Jesus' public career, although he recognized that it had been preceded by work in Capernaum,[6] because it seemed to him a beautiful description of the whole career of Jesus. It was not intended by Jesus to be an announcement of his Messiahship for he concealed his Messianic consciousness after it had fully developed,[7] and the audience on this occasion did not regard it as such.

Luke knew that it must have been true that "they all

[4] Lk. IV:16-30.
[5] Is. LXI:1-2.
[6] Lk. IV:23.
[7] Lk. IX:20-21.

bare him witness and wondered at the words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth." Certainly the few humble sick folk on whom he laid his healing hands would have carried away this impression, and Luke may have met some of them in searching through Galilee for Gospel material. But Luke also brings out the rougher side of the experience. Perhaps it was on the second Sabbath that Jesus explained, in what seemed to be an offensively unpatriotic way, his inability to do in Nazareth any such "mighty works" as had been done in Capernaum. It was a way that was particularly pleasing to the catholic spirit of Luke and his Gentile readers. Jesus said that God had often been more ready to do wonderful things for foreigners than for his own people! The extreme anger of the audience at this statement, which almost led to lynching him, is intelligible only in case there was more involved in the situation than appears on the surface.[8] This unpatriotic readiness to think well of foreigners was the same spirit that Jesus had shown when he used to refuse to go with other young Nazareth men to attend the patriotic meetings of the Judas and Saddouk party in their revolutionary agitation against Rome and that had led him to go south to John the Baptist instead of allying himself with the northern revolutionists (p. 61). The same force of character and uncompromising loyalty to conviction on the part of Jesus that made for him such bitter enemies during his public life, had probably at an earlier time made enemies in Nazareth. The hot anger of the audience now afforded an opportunity to pay off old scores and gratify old prejudices. After the service some of

[8] Luke very probably saw in this incident a forecast of the way in which the Jews would later regard the evangelization of the Gentiles, but it is very improbable that either he or his source created the narrative to show this.

these fiery patriots hustled Jesus down the street and were on the point of pitching him over a cliff outside the town, but did not do so. Luke's graceful style obscures the real ugliness of the action he describes: "He said unto them, Doubtless ye will say unto me this parable, Physician heal thyself; whatsoever we have heard done at Capernaum do also here in thine own country. And he said, Verily I say unto you no prophet is acceptable in his own country. But of a truth I say unto you, There were many widows in Israel in the days of Elijah, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, when there came a great famine over all the land; and unto none of them was Elijah sent but only to Zarephath in the land of Sidon, unto a woman that was a widow. And there were many lepers in Israel in the time of Elisha the prophet and none of them was cleansed, but only Naaman the Syrian. And they were all filled with wrath in the synagogue as they heard these things; and they rose up and cast him forth out of the city, and led him unto the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they might throw him down headlong. But he passing through the midst of them went his way."

After this experience in Nazareth Jesus pushed his Galilean propaganda with great energy. He used for this purpose the twelve men whom he had appointed at the semi-private meeting in the hill country about Capernaum. The list of their names appears in all three of the Synoptic Gospels (also in Acts) and in no two are the lists exactly alike.[9] This may indicate that there was some doubt later regarding the exact personnel of the group. There were apparently some who were so closely associated with the Twelve as to be easily con-

[9] Mk. III:16-19, Mt. X:2-4, Lk. VI:14-16, Acts I:13-14.

fused with them. Two such were considered eligible for the vacancy occasioned by the treachery of Judas.[10]

These men had been selected because of their fitness for such work as Jesus is now about to send them out to do and also perhaps because of such administrative gifts as would fit them for the tribal headships that Jesus is reported to have planned for them.[11] It was necessary that they should be men susceptible to new ideas and capable of catching Jesus' disposition, not men of extreme Pharisaic conservatism; men of sufficient force to stand their ground against adverse criticism; men able to communicate ideas and conduct a platform or conversational propaganda. The four fish dealers and the publican Matthew (Levi?), whom Jesus had earlier called to discipleship, were among the Twelve, also a man named Simon called "the Cananæan" ("fiery" or "zealous") by Mark, "the Zealot" by Luke, ordinarily considered to be a member of the Judas-Saddouk revolutionary party.[12] Two of them, Philip and Andrew, had Greek names, which indicates that their parents were not fanatically anti-foreign in their sympathies. James and John, the sons of the fishpacker Zebedee, were called "Boanerges," which Mark understands to mean "Sons of Thunder." The title, so understood, suggests that they were rough, thundering men, ready to break out into fearless action that might lead to martyrdom, or ready to call down God's thunderous rebuke on the enemies of their Lord, as they are elsewhere said to have done.[13] Peter's name always heads the list and the name of Judas Iscariot comes last. What Iscariot means is uncertain, possibly "man from

[10] Acts I:21-23.

[11] Mt. XIX:28.

[12] For the view that the title perhaps describes simply his personal zeal see Jackson and Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. 1, p. 425.

[13] Lk. IX:51-55.

Kerioth." There was a place of this name in Judæa and another in Moab,[14] and if either of these was his home town he was not a Galilean like the rest. He must have been a man who seemed to Jesus to possess great ability but as time went on he did not develop the requisite character.

These men were sent out to do what they had seen Jesus do. They preached the nearness of the Kingdom and repeated, as well as they could, what they had so often heard Jesus say about the way to live in order to be ready for its coming.[15] They tried, no doubt with considerable success, to exorcise demons, using a formula which had in it the name of Jesus.[16] The fame of Jesus, the mighty prophet of God, the herald of the Judgment Day, made his name terrifying to all demoniacs and gave it therapeutic power. They rubbed oil on the bodies of the sick, perhaps also using the name of Jesus, and effected many cures. There was no occasion to speak of Jesus as the Messiah even if they at this time had thought of him as such.

Jesus sent them out in pairs because the word of two witnesses testifying to the nearness of the Judgment Day would be more effective than the unsupported testimony of one. In Jewish courts the importance of having more than one witness was recognized.[17] Moreover two men would quicken each other's wits and support each other in the difficult situations which the presence of hostile scribes in many communities would surely produce. They would have to meet the Beelzeboul theory (p. 118). Scribes who had not hesitated to accuse Jesus of being Satan's

[14] Josh. XV:25, Jer. XLVIII:24.
[15] Mk. VI:7-13.
[16] *Cf.* Mk. IX:39.
[17] *Cf.* II Cor. XIII:1.

ally would bring the same charge against Jesus' messengers: "If they have called the master of the house Beelzeboul, how much more them of his household." Some of them, going back to their home towns, would find members of their own families turned against them as had been the experience of Jesus in Nazareth. "I came to set a man at variance against his father," "a man's foes shall be they of his own household," Jesus is reported in Q to have said at this time.[18]

Emphasis is laid on the meager equipment that was to characterize their campaign. They were to take no money, not even small change in the girdle, no bread, no traveling bag, only one shirt ("chiton"), light sandals. Prophets often symbolized their message by some dramatic peculiarity of dress or manner. This meager equipment was a dramatic portrayal of haste and of the urgent need of instant action. The Judgment Day and the Kingdom of God were near! It was as if a man, bare headed, in his shirt sleeves, and with slippers on his feet, should be seen galloping by on horseback. Everyone who sees him knows that he bears some urgent message or has some serious business on hand. When these men met anyone on the way they were to hurry on without stopping for the leisurely greetings characteristic of oriental courtesy. When they reached a village they were to seek out the family most likely to be in sympathy with them—Jesus had many friends all over Galilee—take lodgings there and spend no time in ordinary social intercourse. They probably tried to get the privilege of speaking in the synagogues on the Sabbath and on other days talked with groups in the market places, just as Jesus was always doing. If they found a community set against them as Nazareth had been, they were to waste no time on it, but

[18] Mt. X:25, 35-36, Lk. XII:51-53.

were to leave it with dramatic oriental gestures proclaiming its doom in the Coming Judgment, and hurry on to the next village.

Any description of apostolic evangelizing would naturally more or less reflect customs prevalent among evangelizers at the time when Gospel material was being gathered. Miscellaneous oral tradition, current in the many communities visited by apostles, would have been particularly active at this point, and influential in developing habits of evangelization. There is very little if anything in Mark's Gospel that does not seem thoroughly suitable to the original situation. The other two Gospels, especially Matthew (X: 16-42), include matter, in this connection, that evidently suits a later period, when Christian witnesses were being arrested, tried in the local sanhedrins, beaten in the synagogues as criminals; when members of a family were lodging information with persecuting authorities against their nearest relatives; when Christians were being brought before procurators and kings in the eyes of foreign nations. All the confident, comforting, encouraging words of Jesus that could be gathered from miscellaneous collections of his teachings were massed at this point and so shaped as to make them useful in the time of need greater than could have been experienced in these few weeks when the Twelve were traveling about by twos in Galilee.[19] One such utterance in particular will come up for consideration later (p. 250): "Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel until the Son of Man be come."

[19] This does not necessarily imply a very late date for Q. According to the Acts Jews in Palestine and in the dispersion were very early eager to bring Christians before Roman authorities. According to Tacitus Christians were already very unpopular in Rome before the great fire in 64 and this fact would have increased their natural unpopularity in the provinces.

Luke's Gospel adds an account of a later sending out of seventy, two by two, whose equipment and conduct were to be like those prescribed by Jesus for the Twelve.[20] While they were out on their preaching venture, Jesus is reported to have had a profound spiritual experience. As he in imagination followed these thirty-five pairs of venturesome men, saw them exorcising demons, curing the sick and telling their marketplace audiences how to prepare for the breaking in of the New Age, he had a vision of the utter overthrow of Satan's empire. He saw Satan fall from the heavens with all the swiftness of a lightning flash. Jesus felt that the power of God would work in these messengers, and others like them, for the utter overthrow of evil in the world. All the right minded in Israel ought to pray God to send out more such into his ripe harvest field. It filled his soul with exultation that these common men whom the rabbis regarded as mere "babes" could be used by God to do this great thing which the wise and learned rabbis in their pride of spirit could not accomplish. He found in the successes they reported to him on their return confirmation of his own inner sense of leadership that had sprung out of his profound religious experience with the will of God: "In that hour he exulted in the Holy Spirit and said, I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst conceal these things from the wise and learned and didst reveal them unto babes." "All things have been delivered to me by my Father, and no one knows who the Son is except the Father, and who the Father is except the Son and he to whomsoever the Son wills to reveal him."

When they reported to him the satisfaction it had given them to see the spectacular flight of demons from the bodies of demoniacs, terrified by Jesus' name, he as-

[20] Lk. X:1-20.

sured them that this was only a small item in comparison with all the wonderful experiences awaiting them in the New Age: "The seventy returned with joy saying, Lord, even the demons are subject to us by thy name. But he said to them . . . do not rejoice in this, that the spirits are subject to you, but rejoice that your names are enrolled in the heavens." Although Jesus was a popular prophet all through the northern country, the scribes, as we have seen, were bitterly opposed to him. His messengers were like sheep venturing in among a pack of wolves! "Behold I send you as lambs in the midst of wolves." These wolfish leaders kept the ecclesiastical organizations of such cities of the lake region as Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum from giving official sanction to his movement: "Woe unto you Chorazin and Bethsaida! Tyre and Sidon would have done better with such a chance."

CHAPTER XV

JESUS' TEACHING ABOUT READINESS FOR THE COMING KINGDOM

THE Gospels have pictured Jesus going through Galilee urging men and women in all the synagogues and on the Capernaum lake front to prepare for the Coming Kingdom and its inaugural Judgment Day. He has sent the Twelve out by twos to travel with impressive haste, scattering themselves among all the villages and hamlets, bringing the message swiftly to every man's door. Can we reconstruct this message with some fulness of detail? When men and women came home after listening to Jesus on the lake shore what did they report that they had heard?

The chief sources of information are the meager report of teaching found in Mark, and the discourse matter distributed through the Matthew Gospel and Luke (Q and matter peculiar to either Matthew or Luke, see p. 9). Apparently no effort has been made in either Matthew or Luke to arrange the teachings in the actual chronological order of their delivery. For instance, the address to the Twelve, when they were sent out into Galilee, occurs in the same chapter of Luke that records the famous conversation in the vicinity of Cæsarea Philippi (IX), while in Matthew the two incidents are six chapters apart (X, XVI). The teachings of Jesus were probably given repeatedly in so many different places

and at so many different times that it would have been impossible for a Gospel compiler to assign many of them to any fixed time or place. The "Sermon on the Mount," or in the hill country (Mt. V-VII), called also "the sermon on the plain" (Lk. VI: 20-49), is the chief exception to this statement. But in this case the Matthew Gospel gathers many teachings more or less logically, but not chronologically, related, if the much shorter report in Luke be considered as more nearly original. There is no indication of any essential change, as time went on, in Jesus' teaching about the nature of the righteous living to which men were summoned in preparation for the Kingdom. Therefore in considering the Galilean teaching we may use any pertinent material, except that found in the record of the last week which will be reserved for separate treatment. The events and teachings of these last days in Jerusalem would naturally, from the beginning, have been quite definitely conceived as regards time and place.

Righteousness, or righteous character, was right character, such character as God would recognize to be right in the Judgment Day that would introduce the Kingdom of God. Righteous life is the kind of life that will be lived in the New Age and that all expectant sons of the New Age must begin to live while they wait for its coming.

Jesus' teaching about righteousness *grew largely out of his own religious experience,* an experience affected by influences both from without and within. The vision of the Kingdom took shape in his own soul and all that was in him rose up to meet its demands. Since it was the Kingdom of *God,* it was for God that he must be ready.

An inner experience with God was evidently the dominant feature of his consciousness. It was this inner personal experience of Jesus with the energy which he taught his disciples to call "the will of the Heavenly Father" that was the source of his life and teaching. The life of God rose unhindered within him. All his soul was aflame with the feeling of the living will of God. What he in this way found God to be produced the great passions of his life, especially his great passion for righteousness, his "hungering and thirsting after righteousness" in himself and in others. What righteousness meant in terms of actual life was determined by what he in his own heart found the will of God thrusting him out to be and do in the various concrete situations constantly arising in the daily life of man.

Righteousness therefore was *primarily a matter of the heart.* A man in his heart found himself in contact with the unseen energy of the will of God, and made his primary adjustment to it there. It was there that the will of God rose thrusting him out into certain expressions of himself by word and act. He was good or bad as he in his heart yielded to or resisted this out-thrusting of the will of God, often so vague and subtle as to tax his understanding and give opportunity for the initiative essential to character. When a man faced a woman, or a little child, or an enemy, or any person in need,[1] if he did not in his heart yield to the will of the Heavenly Father, rising there to overflow in speech and deed, he was bad; if he did yield, he was good. It was necessarily, therefore, in a heart always in contented touch with the will of God that the good man stores up goodness; it was on the rich stores of such a heart that he draws when in an emergency demand is made upon him for righteous

[1] Mt. V:21-48.

acts. It was likewise in the dark recesses of a heart in discontented touch with the will of the Heavenly Father that evil thoughts live and breed, ready to come out into the open at the bad man's summons. Or, using another figure, Jesus said that the heart slowly fills up with either evil or good thought and feeling until the heart finally overflows through the mouth in speech; the heart thinks the foul or the false thought so persistently that finally suddenly, to the surprise even of the man himself, the foul word or the lie is spoken. "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. The good man out of his good treasure bringeth forth good things, and the evil man out of his evil treasure bringeth forth evil things." [2] It was "the pure in heart" who would "see God" [3] in the radiant life of the New Age and who, by implication, would experience a growing awareness of his presence in the meantime. There were those who cleaned their bodies by ceremonial ablutions when they went up to the temple to see God; Jesus said they should clean their hearts. The heart is the "hot spot in consciousness," the central point at which one takes up his whole life and sets it with supreme purpose in a certain direction. The "pure in heart" are those who with unadulterated central purpose commit all their lives to the doing of the will of God.

More explicitly *the righteous heart is the sincere, or honest heart.* It is the heart that has nothing to conceal, that does not wish to seem, in the outer life, better than the heart really means at any cost to be. Jesus' great summons to "repent" was in essence a summons to be honest, to admit the facts, to come sincerely out into the

[2] Mt. XII:34-35.
[3] Mt. V:8.

open, abandoning all efforts longer to conceal the inner state. His "woe, woe" was pronounced over the persistent "hypocrite." "Hungering and thirsting for righteousness" is an exercise of the honest heart. It is hungering and thirsting for character and not for reputation. Its simple "Yes" and "No" unsupported by any oath will be absolutely reliable![4]

All through the nation this bed-rock sincerity was needed, all men needed to repent of their varying degrees of insincerity. The Galilean brigands or revolutionists whom the Procurator Pilate had his soldiers kill at the very time when they were offering sacrifices at the temple were not specially in need of repentance. And the eighteen men in the Jerusalem suburb, Siloam, who were killed by the collapse of a tower which they were perhaps repairing, were not worse than other men. "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish."[5] The whole nation must come out into the light and lay its life bare before the face of God.

Still more explicitly righteousness consists in having a *heart that is sincere and unreserved in its "love."* We may anticipate here the teaching of Jesus during the last week of his life by citing the compact statement explicitly made then but implicit in all his teaching. Both Luke and Matthew take it from Mark. (Luke assigns it to an earlier period.) One of the scribes asked him, "What commandment is the first of all? Jesus answered, The first is, Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God, the Lord, is one, and thou shalt love the Lord Thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind and with all thy strength. The second is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is none other commandment

[4] Mt. V:33-37.
[5] Lk. XIII:1-5.

greater than these." [6] In the Matthew Gospel Jesus prefaces the second commandment by the statement that it is "like unto the first." The fundamental significance of these two commandments in Jesus' idea of righteousness becomes evident when we see what he meant by "God" and what he meant by "love." The meaning of these words will appear in the detailed explication of them found in the further examination of the teaching of Jesus, but before proceeding to note these details the general viewpoint which they will reveal may be briefly described here. In general "love," as Jesus used the word, seems to be a warm active desire to see a person become all that his nature indicates he ought to be, and to work with him, so far as it is feasible to do so, in the execution of every good purpose to which he sets his will. God, in Jesus' vision of the Kingdom of God, had set his will toward the producing of a wise, powerful, honest and friendly race of men. The unseen energy of his living will was rising in every man's heart to claim it for the wise, honest and friendly life. His will was pushing all men on, in ways that sometimes seemed gentle and sometimes rough, to desire and produce an honest and friendly civilization, like that which was supposed to prevail in heaven: "Thy Kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." When, where and how this was to take place will be considered later. The point now is that sometime, somewhere there was to be a righteous race of men whose righteousness would consist in honesty, friendliness, wisdom and power manifested in each individual life and in all social customs, laws and institutions. Since God had set his will toward securing such a result, to "love God" was to work with him to the utmost in securing this result. To fail to love God, that is, to

[6] Mk. XII:29-30, Mt. XXII:36-37, Lk. X:27-28.

oppose him, whether actively or passively by the dead weight of indifference, was also necessarily to fail to love men, because God had set himself to do a great good thing for men. To "sin" against God in this way was also necessarily to sin against society, for God had set himself to produce a great and good social result. From Jesus' standpoint religion and ethics are inseparable. Each in its very nature involves the other. The second great commandment is "like unto the first." It is the sense of loving relationship to the Heavenly Father that is to serve as motive for the life of invincible good will to men. Because one remembers who his Father is and what the high traditions of his family are he succeeds in loving even his enemies. "Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you that you may become sons of your Father who is in heaven; because he makes his sun rise on bad and good and he rains on righteous and unrighteous. . . . Do you therefore be perfect as your Heavenly Father is perfect," [7] that is, perfectly impartial in the outgoing love of your hearts.

Sometimes in the teaching of Jesus emphasis is laid on the phase of love that looks Godward and sometimes on the phase of the same love that is turned toward men. We may look first at the places where various phases of loving God appear. Underlying all Jesus' teaching about God is the thought of his Fatherhood, which appears in the passage just cited. While the idea is found earlier in Jewish thought and also outside of Jewish thought altogether, it appears in Jesus' teaching as fundamental and with all the warmth and large dimensions of the personal experience of the one who felt himself to be "the Son

[7] Mt. V:44-45, 48.

of God, The Beloved." The hearts of men should turn to God spontaneously as the hearts of children turn to a good father. He is responsive reality and they will surely find him. They should ask him freely for what they need. He is a generous Father, always holding out some good thing for his children to take. They should knock at his door. There is a Father on the other side of the door, a Father never too busy to open the door and let his children in. All this Jesus repeats with a conviction born of his own personal experience. "Ask and it shall be given to you; seek and ye shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you; for everyone that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened." "If ye, then, being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father who is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?" [8]

In the experience of Jesus, as we have seen, this loving approach to the Heavenly Father in prayer often brought instantaneous response. He found that what he was praying for was happening (see p. 85). But there were situations in which the thing prayed for could not immediately happen. Jesus found, too, among his disciples many who were not yet sufficiently developed in character to be able to pray as he prayed. To such Jesus said that men should never cease praying, no matter how much the ills of life might tend to make their prayer grow faint and fitful and finally cease. "Men ought always to pray and not to faint." In the terrible times that would precede the Judgment Day men would be tempted to think that the Heavenly Father had abandoned his children to their persecutors. This they must never think. Even a judge who is a grafter and has no fear of God or men will in

[8] Mt. VII:7-8, 11.

mere self-defense yield to unwearied petition. How much more is it true that God will heed the prayer of his elect! [9]

This loving approach to God in trustful prayer involved *thankfulness* for answered prayer. Men must not appeal to God for help and forget him when they have received it. Ten men with leprous spots, shut out from community life, recognized Jesus at a distance, and shouted to him an appeal for help. He called back to them the command to report to the priests in Jerusalem for a clean bill of health. Either immediately, or more probably later on their way to Jerusalem, they found that the leprous spots had disappeared. Only one of them, and he a Samaritan, made his way back to Jesus, fell at his feet and thanked God with exultant outcry. Jesus' comment was: "Were there none found that returned to give glory to God save this alien?" [10]

When men who have been bad begin to love God and therefore to work obediently with him for the honest and friendly world which his will is set to produce, they are said to "repent." *Their "love" involves "repentance."* Such repentance is eagerly watched for in heaven and causes great rejoicing among all God's angels.[11] God is like a watchful father always expecting the return of a wayward son. He finally sees him far down the road coming home ragged and barefoot, but with loving penitence expressed in every homeward step. He runs down the road to meet him, takes him in his arms, kisses him repeatedly and makes all the home glow with joyful wel-

[9] Lk. XVIII: 1-8, *cf.* also Lk. XI:5-9.
[10] Lk. XVII:11-19.
[11] Lk. XV:7, 10.

come.[12] The publican, whose soul was bowed down with a sense of guilt which could express the beginnings of its love only in a penitential sob, went home from prayer in the temple pronounced righteous by a sympathizing God.[13] The relation between the forgiven penitent and the gracious God is one that develops to the utmost the love that began in repentance. It was evident from the overflowing love in her soul that the despised wayward woman, who slipped into the Pharisee's house to wet the feet of Jesus with her tears, had been forgiven.[14]

Love for the Heavenly Father involves trusting him to supply what his children need.[15] Those who live so close up against the honest friendly will of God must not be nervously anxious, always worrying about the food and clothing that will soon be needed. The Father who is the source of man's marvelous life can surely be trusted to see that his child has food enough to sustain it. The Father who has produced the wonderful body will surely provide opportunity to get a little simple clothing to put on it. The greater gift implies the lesser. "Is not the life more than the food and the body than the clothing?" Even the birds are provided with an environment in which they can find food. Surely man who is so much more valuable than birds will find his environment affording him opportunity to get food. Anyway nervous worry accomplishes nothing. It cannot prolong the course of one's life by even so little as a single cubit. In the midst of cheap sparrows chirping and flying all about him, sold

[12] Lk. XV:11-24.
[13] Lk. XVIII:13-14.
[14] Lk. VII:47.
[15] Mt. VI:25-34, Lk. XII:22-31.

in the market at two for a penny or five for two pence, yet cared for by God, how can a son of God walk about in danger of nervous breakdown from fear that his Father has forgotten him! "Behold the birds of the heaven, that they sow not neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; and your Heavenly Father feedeth them." In the midst of cheap weeds, used as fuel to cook the poor man's meal, and yet clothed with beauty by God, how can the Heavenly Father's child fear that God has forgotten him! To do so is to behave like Godless Gentiles. "If God so clothe the grass of the field which to-day is and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?" Men must set their hearts on God, his Kingdom and its righteousness. With the coming of his Kingdom and its civilization of wise, honest, friendly men, will come also all the food and clothing that men need. "But seek ye first his Kingdom and its righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you."

This trust in God's providence is one aspect of the *faith which is involved in loving God.* Those who lack the unworrying trust described in the preceding paragraph are said to have "little faith." [16] The word is used here as we have found it used before, to designate the devout obedient reaching up of the soul to work together with God for the accomplishment of his great purpose. It is a word involving vigorous action of the entire being. In the passage just discussed it does not imply that food and clothing come without effort into the lap of him who simply sits still and "trusts." The birds are busy most of the time searching for food. When a man in the faith that involves the utmost use of all his powers lays hold on the will of God to work with it in love for the creation of an honest and friendly world, almost inconceivable re-

[16] Mt. VI:30.

sults may be expected. Faith is like an explosive of such tremendous power that a minute fragment of it would produce something astounding. In picturesque oriental speech Jesus said that a bit of it no larger than a minute mustard seed would move a mountain, or uproot a tree and plant it in the ocean bed.[17] In the context of both these utterances Jesus was trying to shock the disciples out of an unsatisfactory, faithless frame of mind. In the Matthew context they had just failed in an attempted exorcism; in the Luke context they were piously asking, apparently with ambitious desire for spectacular power, to have their faith increased: "Lord, increase our faith!" Jesus rather brusquely informed them that they had none of the genuine article to start with, that no increase of anything they yet had would produce any result!

On the negative side Jesus specifies one great *source of disobedience to God, of paralyzing unfaith, of calamitous unrighteousness, namely, money.*[18] It stands over against God as his great rival, the Anti-God. Between these two man must make choice of a master. "No man can serve two masters." "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." Jesus had probably found in his experience with men that it was generally their absorption in the accumulation of property that kept them from doing what he represented the will of God to be requiring of them. God was requiring them to work with his will for honesty and friendliness in their own hearts and in all the world. Jesus regarded the acquiring of property as a menace to the development of the friendly heart, and the complete devotion of one's self to money making as absolutely de-

[17] Mt. XVII:20, Lk. XVII:6.
[18] Mt. VI:19-24, Lk. XII:33-36, XVI:13.

structive of the friendly disposition. This will appear more clearly later when love for other men as an essential element of righteousness is discussed. In the passages under discussion now emphasis is laid on the fact that property is a phenomenon of the present age and one that does not last. If it is in the form of certain metals it will rust away, if in the form of rich clothing and rugs moths will eat it, and thieves are always liable to dig through the wall and steal it, whatever be its form. If one makes this his "treasure" it will get his heart. "Where your treasure is there will your heart be also." The single heart is the undivided attention, and "what gets your attention gets you." The money-making man has given his attention to something that will not last. He outlasts it and is finally left without the only thing he has trained himself to care for. He is therefore like a man in the dark, groping about after that which has disappeared, and not seeing anything that he wants. He should have been storing up "treasures in heaven," that is, in the permanent world, the world that does not disappear. "Treasure not up for yourselves treasures on the earth where moth and rust disfigure, and where thieves dig through and steal. But treasure up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust disfigures and where thieves do not dig through and steal. For where your treasure is, there also will be your heart." As will appear later, these treasures in heaven are friendships. They endure: man does not outlast them. He may therefore with entire security give himself to them and let them get him. But he who sets his heart on acquiring property incapacitates himself for friendship and for working together in "faith" with the will of God for the creation at any cost of an honest and friendly world. He has not the "righteousness," or rightness of character,

requisite for a place in the great Empire of Friendly Men.

A man cursed with the love of money is like a body with a diseased eye. A healthy eye is like a lamp giving light to all the other members of the body so that they can do their work. A diseased eye leaves hands and feet in darkness. In the case of the man who loves money some faculty of the spiritual nature becomes diseased, fails to function properly and leaves a person in the dark. He cannot wisely decide what course to take. The faculty by which he discriminates between right and wrong has become unreliable. Such darkness is terrible; it means the ruin of life, the wreckage of personality. "The lamp of the body is the eye; if therefore thine eye be single (clear), thy whole body will be full of light. But if thine eye be bad thy whole body will be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is the darkness!"

It is not the rich alone that are threatened by this peril. The context in both Matthew and Luke [19] pictures the poor who worry about food and clothing as in equal danger. They may become so absorbed in the anxious struggle for the necessities of life that they become incapacitated for friendship. Their disposition easily becomes essentially the same as that of the rich. The rich may be satisfied because they have money; the poor dissatisfied because they do not have it. The poor may be bent on getting money; the rich bent on keeping it.

A passage found only in the Matthew Gospel emphasizes the fact that in the case of the truly righteous *all outer religious activities spring from love for God* and are

[19] Mt. VI:25-34, Lk. XII:22-34.

engaged in with no desire for public applause, but only for the approval that the loving Father will make his children feel in the secrecy of their hearts.[20] There are those who with pretentious, though spurious, righteousness give alms to the needy in such a way as to secure public notice. They get the publicity that they seek, but they lose the invaluable sense of God's approval in their hearts. The true children of God slip their alms into the hands of their needy brothers so unobtrusively that the donor's left hand does not see what the right hand is doing. Jesus had himself probably often given alms in this way and had felt the incomparable joy of the Heavenly Father's approval. "Take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men, to be seen of them: else ye have no reward with your Father who is in heaven. When therefore thou doest alms, sound not a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men. Verily I say unto you, They have received their reward. But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth." [21]

There were those who took pains to have the prayer hour overtake them in some public place, on a busy street corner or at the synagogue which was a kind of community

[20] Mt. VI:1-8, 16-18.

[21] Mt. VI:1-3. This passage and VI:5-8, 16-18 are very likely parts of Q that Luke did not use. They have probably been modified by the compiler of the Matthew Gospel. In ch. XXIII the term "hypocrite" is, as here, freely applied to the scribes, but in Luke's parallel report the word does not appear. The Matthew Gospel was produced in an environment in which there was great hostility between the church and the synagogue (p. 16). The shaping hand of the compiler may not have stopped with the introduction of the word "hypocrite." The underlying teaching of the paragraph, however, is thoroughly in accord with the general tenor of Jesus' teaching. If Jesus had the scribes in mind here it was, as has been noted before, because it was, presumably, the worst element in Pharisaism that arrayed itself against him.

house, where there would often be a group of susceptible people. The loving child of God seeks his Father in the inmost chamber behind the shut door and experiences there the deep satisfaction of his Father's presence.[22] Jesus in his Nazareth days may have seemed less prayerful than some others often found at the synagogue, but his praying heart had found some secluded place for prayer. There were those who, when they fasted, distorted their faces with pious gloom and went impressively about among the admiring crowds with the uncombed hair and unwashed face of the habitual ascetic. The loving child of God, as Jesus half humorously pictures him, when he has occasion for penitential fasting, uses hair oil, washes his face, and goes along the street as cheerfully as if going to or from a feast! The Heavenly Father gives him as inner reward the tender sense of forgiven sin.[23] The fundamental fault in these spurious specialists in righteousness was that they ignored the chief factor in the situation, the living God. It was as if a farmer, exhibiting his stock at the fair, should ignore the presence of the committee on awards and be swollen with pride over the attention he attracts from a crowd of small boys.

The best picture of men turning in righteous love to God, looking with the full energy of penitent faith for the Coming Kingdom, is found in *the prayer of the righteous men* taught by Jesus to his disciples. They stand together, one in spirit, all hearts turned intently toward their common Father in the unseen heavenly world. They wish all men and angels to bow in reverence when his Holy Name is heard. With the full energy of active faith they

[22] Mt. VI:5-8.
[23] Mt. VI:16-18.

wish to see the earth filled with the honest and friendly men of his Kingdom, finally doing his will on earth as perfectly as it is being done in heaven. They trustfully look to him as the source of food and the life that food sustains. They have forgiven their enemies as the children of a Heavenly Father ought to do, and so ask confidently for the inner sense of his forgiveness. In these last days before the Kingdom comes, while the dominion of the Evil One on earth is not yet ended, they pray, with humble self-distrust, not to be treated as stronger than they are, not to be made to test their powers in conflict with the Evil One (Jesus remembered his own fierce conflict), but rather to be rescued from his ruinous designs.[24]

[24] The "Lord's Prayer" is found in two forms: Mt. VI:9-13, Lk. XI:2-4. Probably Luke gives, as often, the form more nearly like that found in Q. It is a brief list of prayer topics given, according to Luke, in response to the request of a disciple for such forms of prayer as John the Baptist had composed for his disciples (Lk. XI:1, V:33).

CHAPTER XVI

JESUS' TEACHING ABOUT READINESS FOR THE COMING KINGDOM (*Continued*)

AS we have seen, the righteousness that fits for the Coming Kingdom is comprehensively described by Jesus as consisting in a sincerely loving heart. We have seen what Jesus taught about the different reactions of such a heart when turned Godward. How ought such a heart to manifest itself in the circle of human relations? As the will of God is allowed to rise freely in the souls of men to express itself in the honest and friendly life, what sort of actions will result? *The general principle is that a man's love for his neighbor shall be as strong and reliable as his love for himself:* "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." To love a person is to have a warm active desire to see him develop into all that his nature indicates he ought to become, and to have, so far as is consistent with the common good, whatever will conduce to this end. To ignore the common good in wishing him well would be to fail to "love" the rest of the neighbors. To love one's neighbor as himself does not involve coddling the other man, making things over-easy for him, doing things for him that he ought to do for himself, because one would not coddle himself. Such treatment would not be conducive to the development of character either in one's self or in another. Neither does loving one's neighbor as himself mean ignoring one's own interests in the effort to safeguard similar interests in the

life of another man. If I allowed another man to sacrifice his interest in order to advance mine, I should lose my self-respect. I must, therefore, not treat another man in such a way as to inflict on him the loss of his self-respect. The requirement evidently means coming to the other man on the level, a pooling of interests, a true "brotherhood," in which each man is as solicitous for the other man's welfare as he is for his own. Or, more fundamentally, since in Jesus' teaching the Kingdom is always in view, and a kingdom is always a civilization, a social order, Jesus' principle means that men shall work together in reciprocal good will, in mutual sacrifice, for the common good. It does often happen that one individual makes a particular sacrifice for the common good that another individual does not make, though both are ready to make it if called upon to do so. It does often happen also that one man makes absolute sacrifice of his own lower interest for the sake of securing a higher interest in the life of another. He lays down his life in the defense of another's honor or for the sake of developing the character of others, as a missionary martyr does. But this he would do in his own case; he would die in defence of his own honor or for the development of his own character in loyalty to his highest ideals. It does not mean that all men are to be treated alike. The common good will determine the treatment accorded each. The man preparing to be a physician must be given special educational advantages that would not be given to another. Special safeguards must be thrown around one who is the only physician in a community during a dangerous epidemic.

Another presentation of general principle is found in Jesus' statement that if anyone wished to be a great man

in the group of those waiting for the Kingdom of God, he must be the *"servant" of the others,* and that whoever wished to be "first" must be "everybody's bondslave." [1] This is an impressive way of emphasizing what Jesus had just been saying, namely, that in the empire of honesty and friendliness men would not delight in the sort of primacy that would enable them to "lord it over" others. "Ye know that those who are accounted to rule (in esteem for ruling?) over the Gentiles lord it over them and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you." The limit set for one's "service" to another is determined by the object of the service, which is to arouse in the other responsive good will and wholesome action. The fundamental elements in character are friendship and work; any kind of "service" that weakens either element is harmful. The mother who becomes her children's "bondservant" in any way that impairs their character is not acting in accordance with this principle.

It is also said by Jesus that *one must "deny himself* and take up his cross." [2] To deny one's self is to deny to one's self the right to supreme consideration. It means bringing the interests of others up abreast of one's own, loving one's neighbor *as* himself. To "take up his cross" is to carry his "self-denial" to the point of preparing for execution by crucifixion as Jesus at the time was doing. Whoever shrinks from this, and "would save his life, shall lose it." That is, whoever concentrates attention simply on saving his own life, thereby fails to deny to himself the right to supreme consideration, fails to love his neighbor as himself. This makes friendship an impossibility and so occasions the loss of life in the Coming Kingdom where life consists in growing friendships.

[1] Mk. X:43-44.
[2] Mk. VIII:34-35.

Jesus' general principle is presented in another form: "As ye would that men should do to you do ye also to them likewise." [3] This means that *a man should treat his fellowman as he would feel that he himself ought to be treated if he were in the other man's place.* It does not mean that an officer should yield to a man in the ranks the obedience that is an officer's due; but that he should treat a private as he would feel that he ought to be treated by an officer if he were a private. It is an appeal for the square deal, for such conduct in any transaction as will make each one who participates in it feel that all the others were as considerate of his interests as they were of their own. No one wished any special privileges for himself in the deal unless possibly they were essential to the common good. To desire special privileges for the sake of enjoying them degrades their possessor: "For everyone that exalteth himself shall be humbled and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted." [4] The one who "exalts himself" is "humbled," or degraded, not by any arbitrary act of God but as a natural consequence of his self-exalting disposition. Such a disposition necessarily stunts his growth, blights his being, makes him less than he would otherwise be. To wish for special privileges simply for the sake of enjoying them is to transgress the deepest law of his being. The man who "does his righteousness before men to be seen of them" [5] is guilty not only of the sinful blunder of ignoring God (p. 164) but also of the great sin of wishing certain of his fellowmen to be less than himself. If all others should make as good an appearance as he does in his spectacular fasting, alms giving and praying, his own pre-eminence would be

[3] Mt. VII:12, Lk. VI:31.
[4] Lk. XIV:11, Mt. XXIII:12.
[5] Mt. VI:1.

gone. He must have others less than himself to serve as background against which to display his own superiority. On the other hand the man who humbles himself, that is, who either surrenders special privileges or, more probably, does his utmost to share them with others and make them commonplace, thereby develops a disposition that "exalts" him, lifts him up to the heights of friendly life and character. It was this disposition that Jesus found in the normal child.[6]

It is not easy to be always giving the same generous consideration to the interests of others that one gives to his own, to be always working for the common good, to be always eager to share one's special distinction. It is simple, but not easy. Yet it is the essential element in the righteous civilization of the Kingdom of the friendly sons of God. Jesus probably had this in mind when he said that the gateway into "life," that is, into the Kingdom, was "narrow" and that he found few passing through it.[7]

The teaching of Jesus about the righteousness that consists in sincere regard for other men appears not only in the general statements just discussed but in the specification of certain details. The "Sermon on the Mount," especially in the form preserved in the Matthew Gospel, contains a number of such.[8] Among the "blessed,"[9] that is, those who are to be congratulated as prospective citizens

[6] Mt. XVIII:1-4.

[7] Mt. VII:13-14, Lk. XIII:24.

[8] Some of them, probably parts of Q which Luke omitted; others parts of Q which Luke reports in a more nearly original form, *e.g.*, "Blessed are ye poor" (Lk.), "Blessed are the poor in spirit" (Mt.); some perhaps taken from some other source than Q.

[9] Mt. V:3-12.

of the Kingdom of Heaven, are those who are *"poor in spirit."* They are those who in spirit feel like poor men, those who are full of sympathy for the men who lack what they themselves perhaps have in abundance. They may be rich (the Matthew Gospel does not commend poverty as Luke seems to do), but they have not forgotten how it feels to be poor; they may be successful, but they have not forgotten how it feels to fail; they may be saints, but they have not forgotten how it feels to be a sinner. They are *those who know how to comfort mourners* with such beautiful friendliness as to make the mourning blessed because it called out such comfort. They are the *"meek,"* that is, those who with due consciousness of their own limitations, with no over-emphasis of their own excellencies, hold themselves ready to contribute to the common good; they wish for no special privileges. Such persons will possess the earth in the New Age of the Coming Kingdom. In another passage peculiar to Matthew probably taken from Q [10] it is said that they will find "rest," that is, contentment, enlargement of life, assurance regarding the future. Jesus had found it in this way. "Learn of me for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls." They are the *merciful,* quick to relieve need, not holding a grudge, hearty and dependable in their forgiveness of those who repent. They are the *"peace makers";* they do all they can to produce real peace, to produce a situation in which men work together in good will for the common good. These qualities make them the "salt of the earth," [11] that which preserves civilization from decay.[12] They keep men bound

[10] Mt. XI:28-30.

[11] Mt. V:13.

[12] Salt here is not thought of in the small quantities used for seasoning food, but rather in the large quantities used for the preserva-

together in the wholesome friendly relations that make community life of a high order possible. They are "the light of the world"; [13] they create an atmosphere in which the work of the world can be successfully done. By virtue of what they are they bring light to the dark spots of life. At their approach sorrows seem less oppressive, burdens grow lighter, temptations to evil lose something of their power.

In this context strong emphasis is further laid on the necessity of a *kindly feeling for others in the heart.* It is not simply necessary to refrain from killing a fellow-man, but to refrain from the ill will in the heart that develops into the murder. Jesus expressed hot indignation at those who could speak of another man in terms of contempt. He apparently caught up certain current epithets expressive of contempt, "raca," "good for nothing," "moreh," "insignificant fellow." [14] They do not express honest dignified moral criticism like the term "hypocrite," which was evidently sometimes on the lips of Jesus, even if the Matthew Gospel exaggerated the frequency of its use (p. 163), but rather a supercilious sense of glad superiority which sees no moral potentiality in another and does not desire to see it. It was useless for a man to attempt to worship God with a gift so long as he had failed to right a wrong done to some neighbor. He might be in the very act of sacrifice, when he remembered what he had done, but must lay his offering down by the altar

tion of fish. Such "salt," when nothing but its impurities remained (popularly still called "salt"), could only be "cast out to be trodden underfoot of men," that is, to make foothpaths.

[13] Mt. V:14-16.

[14] Mt. V:21-22. Perhaps they were terms freely applied by the synagogue to Christians in the environment of the Matthew Gospel. The gradations of punishment mentioned seem to reflect local usage of Jesus' own day or later.

and let the priest wait for him to have an interview with his injured neighbor, even though this might involve retracing his steps over a long expensive journey by land and sea.[15] There must be no such ill will in the heart as is expressed by the refusal to pay one's debts, the refusal to give to another what belongs to him. Some of the early Christians, perhaps because expecting the world soon to end, seem to have thought it unnecessary to pay their debts, especially debts owed to persons who would be destroyed in the Judgment anyway (*cf.* Rom. XIII: 8-10, I Thess. IV: 11-12)! Jesus, speaking as a business man with a keen sense of honor, said dishonest debtors ought not to be let out of jail until they had "paid the last farthing." [16] There must be no such ill will toward a woman as would tolerate lust in the heart. The glance or gesture that invited to such an act should be fiercely repressed; the offending eye be plucked out, the offending hand cut off. There must be such kindly consideration for a wife as would never divorce her except for one most serious reason (*cf.* p. 278). A man must not feel that he had done his duty by an offending wife when he had given her a written statement of his reasons for divorcing her, a statement that would often give her standing in the community as a marriageable woman.[17]

There must be such regard for a fellow man as would not simply keep one faithful to an oath but faithful to his simple word unsupported by any oath.[18] There must be such regard for the other man as would not simply limit revenge—confining it to an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth—but as would refrain from revenge altogether.

[15] Mt. V:23.

[16] Mt. V:25-26.

[17] Mt. V:28-32, *cf.* Mt. XIX:9. In Lk. XVI:18 and Mk. X:11-12 the prohibition of divorce seems subject to no exception.

[18] Mt. V:33-37.

There must be such love for the other man as would be ready to let him have more than he might try to get, either by violence or request. The outflow of good will from the heart of a man into the life of his fellow man is to be so strong and steady that no injury done to either property or person can stop it.[19] It is easy to conceive cases in which literal obedience to some of these teachings would defeat their spirit, but the spirit of regard for the other man that they aim to produce is unmistakable. This spirit is to do away with all censorious criticism, all eager delight in diagnosing and operating on the faults of other men.[20] In all this teaching Jesus was "fulfilling," "filling out," the law of Moses (Mt. v: 17), going all the way where the law went only part way.

The spirit of good will to the other man finds concrete expression in an *unwearying readiness to forgive.*[21] Forgiveness implies three things: a wrong done; the wrong repented and made right; and then the change from disapproving love to approving love on the part of the one who suffered the wrong. Jesus urges the one who has suffered the wrong to be aggressive in forgiveness. Since he has not been guilty of the wrong doing he is presumably more amenable to high moral considerations than the offender. Evidently there can be no forgiveness until there has been repentance. This is distinctly asserted in Luke's report of the teaching: "If thy brother sin rebuke him: if he repent forgive him." [22] The offended party

[19] Mt. V:38-42.
[20] Mt. VII:1-5.
[21] Mt. XVIII:15, 21-22, Lk. XVII:3-4.
[22] Lk. XVII:3.

could not honestly and righteously look with approving love on a person who was persisting in wrong doing. God looks upon such a person with disapproval and so must every right-minded man. But the offended party must do everything in his power to produce the repentance that is the essential condition of forgiveness. The obligation to forgive involves the obligation to do all that can be done to make forgiveness possible. Rebuke becomes a duty. The Matthew Gospel adds some matter here which assumes the existence of a "church" and church relationships and is, therefore, probably an amplification of the teaching of Jesus made by the early Christian prophets or evangelists.[23] The object of the rebuke which makes forgiveness possible is said to be to "gain a brother"; "if he hear thee thou hast gained thy brother." Therefore it is necessary to go to him alone and not humiliate him by publicly taxing him with his fault. If this does not produce repentance the moral force of two or three others must be brought to bear upon him. If this persuasive committee of brothers does not move him, the moral force of the public sentiment of the whole brotherhood must be called out. If this does not awaken within him the spirit of penitent brotherliness, he cannot be allowed to remain in the group of disciples, for the essential characteristic of the group is brotherly regard for each other. The group will look upon him as the synagogue looks on publicans and sinners, namely, as a perverse outsider. If the Matthew Gospel was formed in an environment where church and synagogue were in frequent collision (p. 16), to fall out of the church often meant to go to the synagogue. There would, therefore, be considerable pungency in designating such a convert, or re-convert, to the synagogue as like a "publican and a sinner"! The

[23] Mt. XVIII:16-17.

Matthew Gospel adds a parable [24] which emphasizes the necessity of having the forgiving spirit if one would be righteous before God. It presents the wicked absurdity of refusing to forgive a fellow man after having one's self been forgiven by God. A man who had been forgiven a debt of twelve million dollars, which he could not possibly pay, went instantly out, grabbed by the throat a man who owed him seventeen dollars and mercilessly committed him to the debtor's prison. The parable is introduced by the statement that the forgiving disposition must be fastened upon one as a fixed habit. Seven times a day, day after day, month after month, it must continue. There must be an eternally enduring eagerness to "gain a brother." [25]

[24] Mt. XVIII:23-34.
[25] Mt. XVIII:22, Lk. XVII:4.

CHAPTER XVII

JESUS' TEACHING ABOUT READINESS FOR THE COMING KINGDOM (*Concluded*)

LUKE'S Gospel contains a great deal of teaching peculiar to itself, regarding the righteousness that consists in the kindly treatment of other men. At the forefront of the Gospel stands Jesus' proclamation of his great program stated in terms of human sympathy and relief of human need. Poor people are to have good news preached to them; captives are to be released; the blind are to receive their sight; the heavily handicapped, the bruised and the crippled, are to be given liberty.[1] Jesus illustrates his great principle that neighbor love leads to the life of the New Age by the story of the kindly Samaritan traveller whose heart was full of sympathy for the half dead victim of brigands. He gave him painstaking personal attention on the spot and provided for his future need by an adequate gift of money. Jesus contrasted this practical illustration of true righteousness, true fitness for the New Age, with the conduct of those who were supposed to be unquestionably and conspicuously ready for it, the priest and the Levite.[2] In the immortal story of the Lost Son Found Again, the point of emphasis, as indicated by the context, is the unbrotherly conduct of the older son. Instead of saying "This my

[1] Lk. IV:18-19.
[2] Lk. X:28-42.

brother was lost and is found," he was angered by the father's welcome and would not go in to see his brother.[3]

Luke represents Jesus to have conceived of *prayer* as a species of spiritual activity by which a man might get something for a friend in need. It is as if a man at midnight should find standing at his door a friend on a journey tired and hungry in the midnight darkness. He has nothing to set before the needy traveller. He goes, therefore, to a well supplied home near at hand and says: "Friend, lend me three loaves for a friend of mine is come to me from a journey and I have nothing to set befor him." [4] The praying man stands between the friendly God and the friendly neighbor in need. Many interesting questions arise in connection with this subject. The point just now is that the praying man who is fit for the New Age is the man who wishes to share with his neighbor the supplies of feeling and thought that can be drawn by prayer in accordance with psychic laws from the environing will of God. It will appear in a moment that Jesus in Luke's picture of him required men who would be righteous to share with their neighbors whatever wealth they could draw from their physical environment. So must they also, to be righteous, share with others whatever they draw from their spiritual environment by the expenditure of spiritual energy in prayer.

This righteous good will toward fellowmen is to show itself in *social courtesies.*[5] Home and hospitality were

[3] Lk. XV:11-32.
[4] Lk. XI:5-8.
[5] Lk. XIV:7-14.

great values to be shared with the homeless and needy in the community, and not to be used with a view to securing return invitations into the so-called upper circles of society. "When thou makest a dinner or a supper call not thy friends nor thy brethren, nor thy kinsmen, nor rich neighbors, lest haply they also bid thee again and a recompense be made thee. But when thou makest a feast bid the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind; and thou shalt be blessed . . . thou shalt be recompensed in the resurrection of the righteous." This latter statement seems at first glance to keep the whole matter still on a commercial basis. Whether this is really so depends upon the nature of life in the New Age, Jesus' view of which will appear later. In the same connection (vs. 7-10) Jesus openly commented with genial humor on the quiet rivalries going on among his fellow guests as they manœuvred for the best places at the dinner party of a Pharisee. The unfriendly desire to see another guest in an inferior position seemed to Jesus to be utterly out of harmony with the simple spirit of good will that would prevail in the Kingdom of God. At the Messianic banquet in the Kingdom of God there would be no such social climbing. With a quiet humor, tinged perhaps with a trace of sarcasm, he pointed out a shrewd way to secure the social glorification that each seemed bent on getting for himself: "When thou art bidden go and sit down in the lowest place; that when he that hath bidden thee cometh, he may say to thee, Friend, go up higher; then shalt thou have glory of all that sit at meat with thee!"

The purpose of all social occasions is to stimulate friendliness. Therefore friendly conversation and not an extravagant menu ought to be their chief characteristic. In a collection of miscellaneous teachings and incidents reported by Luke in connection with Jesus' leisurely jour-

ney to Jerusalem an incident is cited to illustrate this.[6] Jesus apears as a guest in the home of a woman named Martha. This woman, with the spirit of oriental hospitality strong within her, set about providing a large number of things to eat. Her sister Mary, on the contrary, gave herself wholly up to listening to Jesus' conversation. When Martha resented this, Jesus protested against her strenuous effort to provide so many things to eat and said that a few things, or even only one thing, would be enough. Mary had been wiser and should be let alone.

Jesus' teaching that righteousness involves invincible good will toward fellowmen appears in the prominence given by Luke to his discussion of the *proper use of money.* In matter common to both Luke and Matthew, on this point, the Lukan picture seems almost ascetic. In the Sermon on the Mount blessing is pronounced on the poor and the hungry instead of on the poor in spirit and those that hunger after righteousness. A woe upon the rich and well fed is added.[7] The renouncing of all possessions seems twice to be required of all disciples,[8] rather than of the one individual to whom according to Mark a special place in the inner circle of disciples was offered. Where Luke says, "Sell your possessions and give alms," the Matthew Gospel reports: "Do not treasure up for yourselves treasures on earth," a protest against accumulating riches.[9] This statement in Luke is not limited to the Twelve when Jesus is given an opportunity to make such limitation.[10]

[6] Lk. X:38-42.
[7] Lk. VI:20-25, Mt. V:3, 6.
[8] Lk. XII:33, XIV:33.
[9] Lk. XII:33, Mt. VI:19.
[10] Lk. XII:41.

Luke has very dramatic material on this point peculiar to himself in chapters XII and XVI. A man in the crowd, whose brother had cheated him out of his share of their father's estate, appealed to Jesus: "And one out of the multitude said unto him, Teacher, bid my brother divide the inheritance with me." Jesus brusquely refused the man's request and proceeded to warn the crowd that life does not consist in the abundance of the things that a man owns. He then pictured for them the dramatic career of a man whose philosophy of life was based on the supposition that true life does consist in a growing estate and luxurious living.[11] The prosperous Syrian farmer kept building larger barns and encouraging his soul to set to and have a good time. No one but himself appears in the picture which is, therefore, in fatal contrast with the picture of the friendly Samaritan. He was suddenly summoned from life by the angelic officials of the great assize: "God said unto him, This night they are asking for thy soul!" He started on the solemn journey friendless and alone, leaving his "things" to be anyone's plunder: "The things which thou hast prepared, whose shall they be?" Jesus said that God called him a blundering fool. He had fooled away his life.

More explicit is Jesus' teaching based on the illustration of the shrewd steward who knew how to make friends by the use of his position against a day of reckoning when he would need friends and home.[12] He was a true "son of this age," the age which the devil was supposed to dominate, but nevertheless something could be learned from his disreputable career by the "sons of light," namely, that a man ought to use his money in a friendly way, as for instance the friendly Samaritan did. "Make

[11] Lk. XII:13-21.
[12] Lk. XVI:1-12.

to yourselves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness; that when it shall fail they may receive you into the eternal tabernacles." Men who use their money righteously in the interest of others lay the foundations of everlasting friendships. When the end comes and their souls are asked for they will find friends on the other side to welcome them into the everlasting homes of the Coming Kingdom. One shows whether or not he is really righteous by the use he makes of his money. Money is an insignificant thing; it is the straw that shows which way the wind blows. "He that is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much" (v. 10). If one does not learn how to use this low, superficial form of power in a friendly way, how can God trust him with the real and higher forms of power that will characterize life in the real and higher world of the Coming Kingdom? "If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches?" (v. 11). Money is a temporary power, coming to one often from another by inheritance, certain to pass into the hands of another at death. If one does not learn to use this transient form of power in a friendly way, how can God trust him with the permanent forms of power that will characterize the permanent civilization of the Coming Kingdom? "And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another's, who will give you that which is your own?" (v. 12). Then follows the picture of a man who refused to use his money in the friendly relief of the sick beggar at his door.[13] He and his banqueting friends passed the sick beggar daily, less attentive to him than the dogs were! In the other world the rich man went into the fiery section of Hades where there were no friends to receive him into blessed homes and where the accomplished banqueter

[13] Lk. XVI:19-31.

could find not even a drink of water. The poor beggar, on the other hand, banqueted in heaven and as a newcomer was given the place of honor next to Father Abraham himself. A deep impassable gorge shut the rich man off from the realm of friendship. The subject of Jesus' teaching about riches will come up again later (p. 284). It is in point here to show that it bulked large in his Galilean teaching regarding the nature of the righteousness that constituted readiness for the Coming Kingdom.

We have so far seen that Jesus' teaching about righteousness grew out of his own religious experience, that he conceived it to be the output in action of a sincere and overflowing heart, a heart full of love to God and, therefore, necessarily full of love to men. One other aspect of righteousness appears in the Galilean preaching—*loyalty to the person of Jesus.* At a later time, when the Gospels were being made and Jesus was known to have been the Messiah, this loyalty to his person naturally meant loyalty to him as Messiah. But during the Galilean period now under discussion Jesus was not thought by the public to be the Messiah, perhaps not by his own disciples, nor, in the specialized technical sense of the title, even by himself (p. 77). Nevertheless, loyalty to him as the prophet of the Kingdom-At-Hand necessarily became to a certain extent an element in righteous readiness for the Kingdom. His own personality became identified with his message. The fact that his message was born out of his own experience, and, therefore, delivered with authority, and also the fact that it was backed up by such manifestations of power in direct exorcisms and healings emphasized his own personality. Furthermore, the fact that he was a

teaching rabbi gathering disciples led to the formation of a party about his person. After he had been declared by the scribal leaders to be a product of hell bearing a message from hell (p. 118), it became natural for all who believed his message to champion his person and emphatically assert their devotion to him as leader. Lines were sharply drawn between those who were for and against Jesus, the prophet, and loyalty to him would naturally be thought of as involved in righteous readiness for the Kingdom. At a later time, when he had begun to express the expectation of meeting a violent death, there appear strong statements about the necessity of a loyalty that would not shrink from dying with him. But also in the earlier period it was perfectly natural to say that loyalty to him might divide a family and that the one who deserted him, the prophet of God, and his ideals of righteousness because of opposition in his own family was unworthy of such a leader and such a goal. The interests at stake were so eternally vital that, in the tense language of Luke's Gospel, one might well "hate" the members of his family who by opposition to Jesus were dragging him down with themselves to ruin in the rapidly approaching Judgment Day.[14] The most merciful way of arousing the family to a sense of its impending doom would be to break abruptly away from it and hurry off to the group gathered about the Prophet of the Kingdom. The same urgent necessity of being identified with the Prophet and his group appears in another passage from Q.[15] A man who had been interested in Jesus' message and was either already among the general group of Jesus' larger circle of disciples (Mt.), or seemed open to an invitation from Jesus (Lk.), said that he must break away from the group long enough to

[14] Mt. X:34-37, Lk. XIV:26.
[15] Mt. VIII:21-22, Lk. IX:59-60.

go home and bury his father. It seems hardly probable that this referred to the few hours of absence necessary for immediate burial, which usually occurred on the very day of the death. The death of his father was probably expected to occur soon and he wished to be on hand to bury him when he died. Jesus insisted that those who were spiritually dead to the nearness of the Judgment Day could be left to bury the physically dead, and that this man's duty was to follow him as a member of the group that with tense expectation waited for the Kingdom, and were busy in eagerly publishing their expectation. ("Do thou go and proclaim the Kingdom of God," Lk.)

The Matthew Gospel pictures one of the scribes, the class usually antagonistic to Jesus (Lk., "a certain man"), insisting that he would loyally follow Jesus wherever he should go.[16] Jesus with a touch of humor gives an answer which implies that the scribe will find none of the things ordinarily sought for by men of his class, chief seats at dinner parties, and other forms of social prestige.[17] The wandering prophet of the Kingdom is more homeless than beast or bird! "The foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head." The insertion of the Messianic title "Son of Man" here was perfectly natural in the period when the Gospels were forming and Jesus' true character was known, but cannot have been on the lips of Jesus during the Galilean period (p. 102).

We have to think of all this rich Galilean section with its busy cities, orchards and fields as thoroughly traversed by Jesus and his assistants. The minds of men and women were everywhere being turned to the Coming Kingdom.

[16] Mt. VIII:19-20, Lk. IX:57-58.
[17] *Cf.* Mk. XII:38-39.

They were confronted with the standards of righteousness that the prophet Jesus said would be applied to the lives of men in the rapidly approaching Judgment Day. What was the effect on the life of the people? This Jesus proceeds to tell.

CHAPTER XVIII

JESUS' ESTIMATE OF HIS WORK IN GALILEE; PARABLES OF THE KINGDOM

JESUS' estimate of the significance of his teaching about the righteousness that constitutes readiness for the Coming Kingdom is found in certain "parables." [1] In Mark's Gospel three which serve this purpose are selected from a large number.[2] They were spoken when Jesus had been teaching throughout Galilee for a considerable time, just after the crisis in his conflict with the scribes occasioned by their publication of the theory that he was in league with Beelzeboul and just before he proceeded to intensify his teaching campaign by sending out the Twelve. The intervening matter in Mark (IV: 35-V: 43) occupied only a few hours, or including the visit to Nazareth (VI: 1-6), only a few days.

There has been introduced at this point into Mark's Gospel, and carried over from Mark into Matthew and Luke, a theory that prevailed in the Gospel making period regarding the reason why Jesus ever used parables at all. The theory was that he wished by this means to hide the

[1] The parable was a way of presenting truth in common use among Jewish teachers. The word was applied to a broad range of illustration; the simple statement, "Physician, heal thyself," is called a parable (Lk. IV:23), and so also is the somewhat extended allegory of the farmer who rented his vineyard to unscrupulous and murderous tenants (Mk. XII:1-9).

[2] IV:1-34.

truth because God had distinctly planned to exclude that generation of Jews, especially its obdurate, scribal and priestly leaders, from participation in the Jesus Messianic movement. Paul held this view (in opposition to the idea, prevalent among many Gentile Christians, that God had permanently "cast off" all the Jewish nation): "That which Israel seeketh for, that he obtained not; but the election obtained it and the rest were hardened, according as it is written, 'God gave them a spirit of stupor, eyes that they should not see and ears that they should not hear,' unto this very day." "A hardening in part hath befallen Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; and so all Israel shall be saved." [3] This idea was attributed by the Gospel makers to Jesus: "And when he was alone they that were about him with the twelve asked of him the parables. (Mt. "Why speakest thou unto them in parables?") And he said unto them, Unto you is given the mystery of the Kingdom of God: but unto them that are without all things are done in parables: that seeing they may see and not perceive; and hearing they may hear and not understand; lest haply they should turn again, and it should be forgiven them." [4] Mark, like Paul, does not understand this to be the permanent destiny of the Jewish nation; it is only a hiding of the truth from one generation preliminary to a more effective proclamation of it to the whole nation after this guilty generation had passed away; God would certainly not conceal truth permanently. Mark assembles at this point a number of fragmentary utterances of Jesus to show this: "And he said unto them, Is the lamp brought to be put under the bushel, or under the bed, and not to be put on the stand? For there is nothing hid, save that it should be manifested,

[3] Rom. IX-XI; especially XI:1, 8-12, 25-27.
[4] Mk. IV:10-12.

neither was anything made secret, but that it should come to light." [5]

These hidden truths were called "mysteries," a word in common use in the religious circles of the Greco-Roman world in which the early church lived and a word suggestive of the "secrets" that were "revealed" in Jewish apocalyptic, or revelation, literature, especially concerned with the unseen world and the prospective break up of the present age. Every religion would be expected to have its "mysteries"; its secret truths revealed to the inner circle of initiates. They were not necessarily hard to understand, but simply difficult to discover, like the secrets of a secret society.

The idea that God was distinctly purposing to conceal the truth from this generation of Jews connected itself in the minds of the Gospel makers with the passage in Isaiah, just quoted above, that described the desperate apostacy of the nation in Isaiah's day.[6] How much of this view was held by Jesus himself? It seems probable that he did cite the Isaiah passage in discussing the situation in which he found himself. The national leaders from Jerusalem had just gone to the perilous extreme of declaring the Spirit of God which Jesus felt within him to be the hot breath of Beelzeboul, and were in danger of eternal sin (p. 120). Whatever Jesus said about them the early Christian preachers and prophets, who gathered and shaped the Gospel material, naturally amplified and

[5] Mk. IV:21-22.

[6] Is. VI:9-10. This passage appears in two forms in the Old Testament, the stern form of the original Hebrew reproduced in Mark, and the milder translation of the Hebrew in the Greek Old Testament, reproduced in the Matthew Gospel, which tries to take the responsibility for their hardening off from God and lay it on the people themselves. Luke, like Mark, uses the severer Hebrew form but shrinks from the last clause: "lest they should repent and be forgiven."

explained in the light of the conflict going on between synagogue and church and the general rejection of Christianity by the Jewish nation in their day.

Parables were well adapted to the tense situation in which Jesus found himself, though not necessarily for the reason given by the early Christian teachers. They enabled him to present truth in a veiled way very provocative of thought in the case of those who were eager for truth and yet not so exasperating as direct unveiled statements in the case of hardened opponents of the truth. They served to draw about Jesus a susceptible group of inquirers very amenable to his desire and left the hardened scribes to go their way unable to challenge his statements.

What is there in the three parables presented by Mark at this point that indicates Jesus' estimate of the significance of his Galilean campaign of preparation for the Coming Kingdom? The first parable describes a small farmer's varied experience with the different parts of his field. Within the extent of one small Galilean field varieties of soil might be found: the hardened footpath running between two adjoining fields; the limestone rock coming near the surface covered only with a thin coating of soil; close by a pocket of soil made very rich by disintegrating limestone with its shells and animal remains,[7] one such pocket full of thistle seeds, another clean and ready for the sower's seed. "Hearken: Behold, the sower went forth to sow: and it came to pass, as he sowed, some seed fell by the way side, and the birds came and devoured it. And other fell on the rocky ground, where it had not much earth: and when the sun was risen, it was scorched; and because it had no root, it withered away. And other fell among the thorns, and the thorns grew up, and choked

[7] Thompson, *Parables by the Lake*, pp. 16-17.

it, and it yielded no fruit. And others fell into the good ground, and yielded fruit, growing up and increasing; and brought forth, thirtyfold, and sixtyfold, and a hundredfold." [8]

In the explanation of this story, given by Jesus privately to his disciples, it appears that he was meaning to describe the different kinds of men and women that he had found as he presented to them the life that they must live in order to be ready for the Coming Kingdom. His classification was based on the degree and kind of attention that they had given to the truths he had presented to them. It was no merely academic classification. The activity of these months had enlisted all the power and passion of his soul. God, the Coming Kingdom, the Judgment Day, the unseen Heavenly World, the souls of men, his own overpowering sense of leadership that would not yet resolve itself into certainty of detail, were vivid realities. Everything he saw in nature, in business life or home life suggested some phase of these great realities that were always in his thought. The farmer's field, for whose cultivation he had many times made the implements, suggested the four classes of people found in the audiences to which he had spoken with passionate eagerness. There were those whose souls hardened against what he said like the hard pathway baked by the sun, beaten by the feet of men. These were the scribes and their followers. The words of Jesus made no impression upon them. Satan was ever at hand, like the hungry sharp-eyed birds in the footpath, eager to remove (Mt. "snatch away") every trace of truth from their attention. It was the scribes, and not Jesus, who were being operated on by Beelzeboul! "And these are they by the way side, where the word is sown; and when they have heard, straightway cometh Satan, and

[8] Mk. IV:3-8.

taketh away the word which hath been sown in them." He had found other men and women giving quick and enthusiastic assent to his appeals to conscience. They seemed to repent of their sins; they talked with him repeatedly on the lake front; they followed him from town to town. Yet he learned by inquiry that when they went to their homes, found the local scribes against them and members of their families bitterly complaining of them for close association with the Prophet's company, they yielded and came no more to him. They could not endure the sour looks and bitter words of the synagogue leaders. They doubted whether the Kingdom was near or whether the Prophet's peculiar ideas about the way to prepare for it were better than those of the scribes. "And these in like manner are they that are sown upon the rocky places, who when they have heard the word, straightway receive it with joy; and they have no root in themselves, but endure for a while; then when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word straightway they stumble." [9] He had found others, of stronger nature, of large capacity for attention and not easily moved by opposition. But they were men engrossed in business, women distracted by household anxieties, people of means absorbed in various agreeable occupations. They could not give prolonged attention to the things Jesus had to say. If they had done so these things would have gripped them. If a man were to bring his wavering attention repeatedly back to the thought of God and eternity for a single hour these ideas might grip him forever. "And others are they that are sown among the thorns; these are they that have heard

[9] Mk. IV:16-17. The word "persecutions" suggests the later time when the synagogue was persecuting the Christians. But the original situation in which leading scribes were ready to execute Jesus and in which John the Baptist had been killed, would also have yielded serious social persecutions.

the word, and the cares of the world, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things entering in, choke the word, and it becometh unfruitful." [10] Last of all there were those who sturdily, candidly, using their capacity for attention to the full, gave themselves to the great ideas of Jesus. They set themselves to be ready for the Kingdom. "Their loins were girded about, and their lamps burning, like men looking for their Lord." They stopped caring so much about making money; they began to comfort people in trouble; and to look out for the interests of others as carefully as for their own. They received the word into "an honest and good heart and held it fast." "And that in the good ground, these are such as in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, hold it fast, and bring forth fruit with patience." [11]

In all this parable the importance of "hearing" is emphasized. Everyone who is eager for truth will get it. Truth will be measured out to him in proportion to the measure of his desire to know and do the truth. Therefore everyone who finds himself having in any degree the willing ear should attend with all his energy to what he hears. He who refuses to do this will find his capacity for seeing truth decreasing, his sense of its reality growing dim and finally altogether gone. "If any man hath ears to hear, let him hear: And he said unto them, Heed what ye hear: [12] with what measure ye mete it shall be measured unto you; and more shall be given unto you. For he that hath, to him shall be given: and he that hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he hath." [13]

[10] Mk. IV:18-19.

[11] Lk. VIII:15.

[12] Not "Be careful what you hear" but "Heed what you hear, give honest attention to what you hear, *act* in accordance with it."

[13] Mk. IV:23-25.

The second parable in which Jesus expressed his estimate of what he had been doing in Galilee is the parable of the crop proceeding steadily toward harvest without further attention from the sower.[14] The farmer simply scatters his seed on the field, then without further thought about it goes his way, sleeps and rises night and day. In the meantime the crop proceeds steadily toward the harvest, blade, head, grain in the head "while [15] he himself is not knowing it," and suddenly on a given day the farmer thrusts in the sickle! "And he said, So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed upon the earth; and should sleep and rise night and day, and the seed should spring up and grow, while he is not knowing it. The earth bears fruit of itself; first a blade, then an ear, then full grain in the ear. But when the fruit is ripe, straightway he puts forth the sickle, because the harvest is come." The illustration expresses the confidence Jesus felt that while he was passing from place to place, not waiting to watch for the results of his preaching in one town before going on to the next, God was preparing men for the Judgment Day and the breaking in of the Kingdom. To men like Judas and Saddouk (p. 35) or their successors, holding secret meetings, conspiring for revolution, the work of Jesus must have seemed vague, weak and futile. But Jesus felt that God was with him. He was working with the same irresistible force that brought crops to harvest. Underneath all of life in Galilee was the will of God bearing all things on to the Great Crisis. After nineteen hundred years millions of men and women all over the earth are eager to learn every detail of what he said and did in the little towns of Galilee!

[14] Mk. IV:26-29.

[15] Not "how" as in the English translation, but "as" in the temporal sense,—"As I was coming in, I saw him."

The third parable [16] is that of the mustard seed, smallest of garden seeds but producing in the rich sulphurous soil about the Sea of Galilee a vegetable the size of a small tree, big enough for birds to build nests in. "And he said, How shall we liken the kingdom of God? or in what parable shall we set it forth? It is like a grain of mustard seed, which, when it is sown upon the earth, though it be less than all the seeds that are upon the earth, yet when it is sown, groweth up, and becometh greater than all the herbs, and putteth out great branches; so that the birds of the heaven can lodge under the shadow thereof." The point lies in the contrast between the minute beginning and the great ending. Here again from the standpoint of such men as Judas and the revolutionists Jesus' unorganized movement seemed only a futile talking out into the empty air, wholly inadequate to the creation of a forceful Empire. But Jesus was sure of God in him, sure that he was being impelled by God to proceed in this way, and that what seemed so inadequate and insignificant would lead to the breaking in of the Kingdom.

The Matthew Gospel (c. xiii) in its parallel to Mark at this point has as usual assembled matter having some general logical connection. It presents seven parables which have in common only the general fact that they are concerned with the Kingdom.[17] They appeal to different classes of people, housewives, merchants, fishermen, gardeners.

[16] Mk. IV:30-32.

[17] Two of them are taken from Mark, the parables of the sower, and the mustard seed, and a third, the parable of the tares, is possibly based on Mark's parable of the earth bearing crops of itself or if not based on it, seemed to the compiler sufficiently like it to warrant omitting the Mark parable from his favorite number seven. A fourth parable, the leaven, appears also in Luke, while three others, the hid treasure, the costly pearl and the drag net appear only in Matthew.

The parable of the small quantity of yeast hidden away in three measures of meal is like the parable of the mustard seed, which it immediately follows. The contrast is between the small beginning and the surprisingly great ending. Three measures of meal was a large baking, such as a chieftain's wife might prepare for her husband's distinguished guests.[18] The little piece of yeast transformed the whole. The apparently insignificant preaching of Jesus and his assistants in the Galilean towns would lead to the World Empire of God. The parable of the man who sold everything he had in order to buy a field in which he knew there was buried treasure, its unknown owner probably long ago dead, and the parable of the pearl merchant who sold all his stock of pearls in order to buy one wondrous pearl, illustrate the wisdom of parting with everything else if necessary in order to be sure of a place in the blessed life of the Coming Kingdom. The parable of the drag net, set all day and dragged to shore in the evening, about which the fishermen gathered to separate the good fish from the worthless ones, illustrated the rapidly approaching Judgment Day when the angels would gather about the human group to pick out the bad ones for burning. The language used here is the conventional description of the fate of the wicked, found elsewhere in the literature of the day.

The parable to which the compiler gives most space, even a little more than to that of the sower which he took from Mark, is that of the poisonous weeds stealthily sown by the vicious enemy in the darkness of the night time on a field where good grain had already been sown by the owner. As the time for harvesting the crop drew near, the poisonous weeds, which until that time had looked much like good grain, were discovered. The farm

[18] Gen. XVIII:6.

hands wished to root them up at once but the farmer forbade it. He said that they would root up the good grain at the same time, if they attempted it. Both were to be left growing until the harvest and then, after both had been cut down, the separation could be safely made. There is a view of the Kingdom underlying this parable which will come up for discussion later when we consider how and when Jesus expected the Kingdom to come (pp. 243-255). It is sufficient now to note in passing the presence in the Matthew Gospel of matter not found elsewhere indicating in the compiler a peculiar consciousness of the presence of bad men in the Christian group. Here in this parable they are found among the good. Earlier in the Gospel certain Christian preachers were mentioned, scandalously liberal in their attitude toward the law of Moses, who might barely get into the future Kingdom, but with no hope of being highly esteemed there, while still others, notable Christian preachers, successful exorcists and healers, would not come into the Kingdom at all because they were workers of "lawlessness." [19] One such bold man, who might be expected to force his arrogant way into the banqueting hall at the time of the Messianic banquet, would find himself quickly tied hand and foot and thrown into the outer darkness.[20]

[19] V:19, VII:21-23.
[20] XXII:11-13, *cf.* p. 319.

CHAPTER XIX

THE GALILEAN PROPHET AND THE PEOPLE EAT TOGETHER BEFORE THE HEAVENLY FATHER

IN the last chapter we have seen Jesus' high estimate of the work that had been done by himself and his assistants in Galilee. He was known later in Jerusalem as "the prophet Jesus from Nazareth in Galilee" [1] and has passed into history as "the Galilean." Near the close of this immortal work in Galilee a remarkable meeting was held in a retired spot somewhere near the Sea of Galilee at which thousands of people were present.[2] The occasion was thrust unexpectedly upon Jesus in a way that must have made it seem to him to be the result of God's arrangement. When the Twelve returned from their campaign in the Galilean villages they were in need of rest. The experience had been a difficult one for them. They had probably not been accustomed to public speaking; their attempts at exorcism of demons and healing of the diseased, sometimes successful and probably sometimes unsuccessful, must have been an exciting activity; the opposition of scribes and their sympathizers had often been exasperating or alarming; and through it all, the feeling that the Judgment Day was near must have kept them constantly under strain. When they came back to

[1] Mt. XXI:11.
[2] Mk. VI:30-44.

Jesus with a detailed report of all their successes and failures, when they "told him all things, whatsoever they had done and whatsoever they had taught," he saw their need of rest, and said to them: "Come ye yourselves apart into a desert (quiet, lonely) place and rest a while." There was no chance for rest where they were, "for there were many coming and going and they had no leisure so much as to eat." So "they went away in a boat to a desert place apart." Jesus did not immediately accomplish his purpose, however, for the crowds saw him starting out with the Twelve, noticed the direction in which the boat was headed and, while the boat with its tired occupants moved slowly across the lake, hurried on foot along the northern shore toward the general region where they saw that the boat would land. The crowd constantly grew as hundreds were gathered up from the lake towns through which they passed. "And the people saw them going and many knew them and they ran together there on foot from all the cities and outwent them." As Jesus, looking across the water, saw these thousands in the distance hurrying along the roads, his sympathy was kindled. He said to his disciples that they seemed to him like flocks of sheep without a shepherd—a pitiable sight in a sheep raising country. John the Baptist, to whom many of them had looked for guidance, was now in prison or already dead.[3] The scribes, their natural religious leaders, seemed to Jesus to be utterly unequal to the great crisis of the "last days." There is some reason to suppose that the great spring festival, the Passover at Jerusalem, was near and that perhaps many of these people were Passover pilgrims

[3] Just before this point in the narrative, Mark inserts the account of John the Baptist's haphazard execution to gratify the spite of Herod's wife and step-daughter who had appealed to his lust and pride (VI:14-29).

coming down from the north and caught here in the lake towns for a few hours on their way to Jerusalem.[4] Jesus knew that the Jerusalem scribes who had recently come north, bitterly attacking him and his ideas, could give the Passover crowds no spiritual guidance. The priests and profiteering bazaar men at the temple would do nothing but exploit these plain people.[5] The people were drifting about like flocks of unshepherded sheep in the last days before the Judgment! Jesus gave up the rest of the day to impassioned teaching, sometimes speaking to the thousands, sometimes to smaller groups and individuals. "He came forth (from the boat) and saw a great multitude, and he had compassion on them because they were as sheep not having a shepherd and he began to teach them much." He talked to them about the Coming Kingdom, and the need of repentance; about the Heavenly Father's will; about forgiveness, trust and peace, about the life of brotherhood that men must live together in order to be ready for the New Order. As the day was drawing to a close he proposed that they should eat together. To eat together was to enter into the intimate friendship of table companionship. What Jesus now proposed was that they should eat together as brothers in the presence of God a meal of solemn penitence and reconciliation. He, as their host, had them arrange themselves in orderly ranks befitting a solemn religious occasion.[6] He prayed in the presence of them all and after the stillness of the prayer the thousands of the poor and heavily burdened, the shepherdless flocks, ate together before God a simple, poor man's meal that was prophetic of the Messianic banquet

[4] Jn. VI:4 says it was the Passover, and the "green grass" mentioned in Mk. VI:39 might indicate springtime.

[5] *Cf.* Mk. XI:15-18.

[6] The women and children by themselves according to Mt. XIV:21,

to which all looked forward in their dreams of the Coming Kingdom. It made the Kingdom of Heaven seem at hand.

The religious significance of this meal was felt by all the early Christians. Long afterward, when the Fourth Gospel was written, it seemed to the author to have been the true paschal feast, presided over by the true Messianic leader of the people.[7] More than this, it seemed to him to have been the true institution of the Lord's Supper which historically was connected with the paschal supper, for he gives no other account in his Gospel of its institution and to his account of this meal he attaches the eucharistic discourse of Jesus upon the eating of his body and the drinking of his blood.[8]

The narrative in its present form emphasizes another feature of this occasion which assumed great significance in the minds of the Gospel makers. It conveys the impression that no other food was used on this occasion besides the five thin cakes of bread and two dried fishes that Jesus' disciples happened to have with them in the boat, and that nevertheless there was far more than enough for 5,000 men besides probably as many more women and children (Mt.). It is not certain from the narrative that no other food was used and many of those present, especially if Passover pilgrims, would have had bread and fish in their wallets. Still Mk. (not followed by Mt. and Lk.) says that Jesus divided the two fishes "among them all," and later Mt. and Mk. (not Lk.) report a similar meal at which 4,000 (Mt., besides women and children) were present, when seven loaves and "a few little fishes" were used and seven hampers full were left over. Furthermore both Mk. and Mt. (not Lk.) make Jesus later refer to these

[7] Jn. VI:4, 14-15.
[8] Jn. VI:25-59, especially vs. 52-58.

two meals in such a way as to show that no other bread was used (fish are not mentioned).[9] Just how the Gospel writers conceived this to have taken place they do not make clear. The narrative might indicate that as fast as Jesus broke off a piece from a cake of bread another piece immediately took its place so that the broken cake was no smaller than it had been before. Or that when finally the broken piece exhausted its capacity for enlargement Jesus took another, and so used all five. In the same way, as he pulled a fish apart the part removed was instantly restored. Or did the increase occur in the baskets of the distributing disciples? In that case each of the twelve began his distribution with a few fragments of the original five loaves and two fishes in his basket and as fast as he took pieces out other pieces took their places so that his basket never became empty—indeed was full at the end. Or did the increase take place in the hands of the eaters so that a piece was never entirely eaten up?

What is to be said about such an account? Apparently one of two things. We may possibly say that certain forces were used by Jesus, either consciously or unconsciously, the like of which we have never yet experienced, but may sometime experience. We have no special difficulty in accepting Jesus' so-called miracles of healing because we have begun to have at least rudimentary experience with psychic force in the healing of disease. But we have as yet no evidence of any sort of force that could be made available for doing such a thing as Jesus is reported to have done in the case of these dried fishes. Another and more probable theory is that this account represents a devout legendary addition to, or exaggeration of, what actually took place. Certain unhistorical stories tend always to gather about the name of a great man. No

[9] Mk. VIII:19-20, Mt. XVI:9-10.

one definitely starts them with intent to deceive. They simply spring up in various ways. Someone suggests what he thinks must have happened or misunderstands what another has said. It would be strange if so great a person as Jesus, afterwards recognized as Messiah, "Lord of all," should have been a complete exception to this general tendency, especially in a credulous age in which the marvelous was accepted as a matter of course. The early Christian preachers in preaching about this wonderful occasion, whose religious significance was so great, might easily have thought of it in connection with the case of the great prophet Elisha: "And there came a man from Baal-shalishah, and brought the man of God bread of the first fruits, twenty loaves of barley, and fresh ears of grain in his sack. And he said, Give unto the people, that they may eat. And his servant said, what, should I set this before a hundred men? But he said, Give the people, that they may eat; for thus saith Jehovah, They shall eat, and shall leave thereof. So he set it before them, and they did eat, and left thereof, according to the word of Jehovah." [10] It is also probable that inasmuch as the Messiah was thought of by many as a second and greater Moses,[11] the early preachers would naturally have felt that Jesus here in the "desert place" (vs. 31, 32, 35) must have been like his great prototype in giving the people free bread in a wonderful way as Moses gave them manna in "the desert." Such a comparison between the two as distributers of free bread is definitely made in the Fourth Gospel.[12] The people are made to say "What doest thou for a sign?" "Our fathers ate the manna in the wilderness." They ask for a daily distribution of free

[10] II Kings IV:42-44.
[11] Deut. XVIII:15, Acts III:21-23.
[12] Jn. VI.

bread like that of the preceding day: "Sir, evermore give us this bread," that is, "Let the endless era of Messianic plenty at once begin." When the presuppositions of the Christian generation in which the Gospels were formed are once understood it is seen to be very natural that such an interpretative addition should have been made to the account of what had really been an occasion of extraordinary religious significance.[13]

After the people, under the guidance of the Prophet of the Coming Kingdom, had finished eating together before the Heavenly Father, Jesus is represented by Mark to have taken strenuous action. He at once vigorously hurried ("constrained") his disciples into the boat before the crowd dispersed and told them to go to a place called Bethsaida, where he apparently expected to join them, coming on foot after he had taken leave of the people. Then he spoke some final words of dismissal to the people who were to find their way back in the late evening to the places from which they had come or were to sleep under the stars, which would have been no great hardship, since probably many Passover pilgrims did this on all the journey. Jesus at some point on his way toward Bethsaida went aside in the deepening darkness to some retired spot on a hill top for prayer. "And straightway he constrained his disciples to enter into the boat and to go before him unto the other side to Bethsaida, while he himself sendeth the multitude away. And after he had taken leave of them he departed into the mountain to pray."[14] No reason for this strenuous action is given by Mark. The Fourth Gospel says it was because a movement started in the crowd to

[13] It is not at all inconceivable that some such rumor should have begun on the spot. The case of Elisha would have occurred to many of these synagogue Bible students as they noted the fact that so many people had eaten together without previous preparation.

[14] Mk. VI:45-46.

force a Messianic rôle upon Jesus, to take him back to Capernaum and on to Jerusalem as Messianic King. It would be to avoid this that he at once got his disciples off and slipped away himself.

The Messianic surmise would naturally have arisen in some minds on such an occasion. The Great Prophet of the Coming Kingdom who had healed so many sick and exorcised so many demons, who had pictured the Kingdom of God so vividly, who had now gathered the great multitude to eat in solemn consecration before God, might easily seem to many to be "that prophet," the Messianic Prophet who should succeed Moses. This would have been a natural surmise if there had been no actual increase of the food supply, only the sharing of such food as many had brought with them. There would have been still more reason for this surmise if some on the spot had begun to wonder how so many could have eaten without special preparation for such an occasion and to suggest that this was really the beginning of the marvelous plenty of the Messianic Age. In any case Jesus' action kept this surmise from developing, for Mark later represents none of Jesus' great popular following in the nation to be thinking of him as the Messiah. When Jesus asked who men said that he was his disciples replied: "John the Baptist; and others Elijah; but others, One of the Prophets." [15]

The nature of Jesus' religious experience during this night of prayer is perhaps to be inferred from his later conduct, which will soon appear. The needs of the unshepherded sheep which had so profoundly stirred him that day must have been uppermost in his mind. More and more they must have forced him to inquire of God whether the general sense of leadership as God's Son, the Beloved, established in his soul at the time of the baptism and the

[15] Mk. VIII:27-28.

testing, involved the assumption of a Messianic rôle and if so a Messianic rôle of what type and with what expectations, for, as we have seen, the popular Messianic idea was vague and varied (p. 40).

This inquiry may have been further necessitated by the apparently providential way in which the situation had been unexpectedly forced upon him. He had crossed the lake with the purpose of securing rest for his disciples, but instead of being able to carry out this plan, a most exciting critical situation had been thrust upon him. He may have been in doubt as to whether this decisive interference with his plans came from God or Satan. He sought the solution of the doubt through prayer. As we shall see in the next chapter, this incident was followed by a period in which he withdrew from public teaching and visited out-of-the-way places. From this period of retirement and reflection he emerged with the full, clear conviction that he must assume the Messianic rôle.[16] It may well be, therefore, that this sacred meal with the multitudes was an event of decisive significance in the development of Jesus' Messianic consciousness.

According to Mark the disciples in the boat, probably rowing leisurely along toward the place to which Jesus was to come on foot, found the north or northwest wind rising and were able to make little headway against it even by hard rowing. If this was near Passover season there was moonlight during some of the night. In the early morning, between three and six o'clock, Jesus from his position on the hill saw them and went out to them, according to Mark (followed by Matthew), walking on the water.[17] When we ask what actually happened here

[16] Mk. VIII:27-30.

[17] The Matthew Gospel adds a paragraph peculiar to itself and in accord with its general tendency to exalt Peter (p. 17). He too

we can only present the alternatives discussed above (p. 202). If it be regarded as the product of a devout imagination it is probably best accounted for by supposing that just as the story of Moses and the manna influenced the Gospel account of Jesus, the second Moses, and the loaves, so it was felt that Moses' power over the sea must have had something corresponding to it in Jesus' career. If both the increase of the food supply and this walking on the water were actual occurrences and not the product of the devout imagination of the early preachers, it seems strange that the disciples in the boat should have been so astounded and frightened. What they had experienced on the land a few hours before would have prepared them for this wonder on the water. Mark feels this incongruity and gives as his explanation the theory that "their heart was hardened." [18]

Fortunately our faith in Jesus as the moral Redeemer and immortal spiritual Leader of men does not rest on his ability to walk on water or so to increase two dried fishes and five bread cakes as to make them into a superabundant meal for thousands. Neither does it require the supposition that the many men who were used by God in the Gospel-making process were lifted out of the truly religious spirit and habits of thought natural to men of their day.

With this solemn meal Jesus' work in Galilee was practically ended. According to Mark Jesus and his disciples reached the region near Capernaum after the episode on the water and found everywhere in country and city multitudes of sick awaiting them.[19] Then followed the break

could walk on the water, though not for so long a time as his Lord and only in entire dependence on his Lord.

[18] VI:52.

[19] VI:53-56.

with the Jerusalem scribes over the tradition (pp. 121-123), especially that which concerned hand washing before eating, which logically belongs with the developing scribal opposition traced in II: 1-III: 30. If it belongs chronologically here in chapter seven it may be an incidental outgrowth of the religious meal which Jesus had allowed thousands to eat without the ceremony of hand-washing. Such an omission would be a peculiarly flagrant offense in the case of a religious meal. At this point Jesus leaves Galilee never to return again for public work. At a later time he passed through it secretly, presumably traveling by night: they "passed through Galilee; and he would not that any man should know it." [20]

[20] Mk. IX:30.

CHAPTER XX

MISCELLANEOUS REMINISCENCES OF JESUS IN THE REGION NORTH AND EAST OF GALILEE

THE section in Mark's Gospel following that which records the termination of Jesus' Galilean work is made up of miscellaneous matter.[1] It shows no such continuity as is evident in the preceding section which pictured the development in Galilee of scribal hostility to, and of popular enthusiasm for, Jesus, Prophet of the Coming Kingdom, healer and exorcist; nor is there any such presentation of Jesus' teaching as is to be found in the section following. Points in Jesus' itinerary, some of them distant from each other, are mentioned, Tyre, Sidon, Decapolis, Dalmanutha, Bethsaida, Cæsarea Philippi, without any apparent reason for going from one to another. No preaching about the Kingdom is mentioned in any of them. The paragraphs in the section seem like miscellaneous reminiscences of Jesus, preserved in various localities where they were later found by the collectors of Gospel material.

We are left to conjecture Jesus' reason for leaving Galilee. He suddenly went north to the region of ancient Tyre, a region which bordered on, and had commercial connection with, Galilee.[2] In a village of this Tyrian

[1] VII:24-VIII:26.
[2] Acts XII:20.

territory he for some reason tried to conceal himself in lodgings: "he entered into a house and would have no man know it." [3] Perhaps it was the home of some Jewish friend, for people (certainly Jews) from "about Tyre and Sidon" had been with him on the Capernaum lake front.[4] It is possible that he sought concealment here to avoid Herod, who, after killing John the Baptist, had begun to notice Jesus.[5] It is far more probable that the opposition of the Galilean scribes, re-enforced from Jerusalem, had become so bitter that he wished by withdrawing from Galilee to keep it from developing further at present. Furthermore, if after the Great Supper there had really been some incipient surmise that he was the Messiah (pp. 204-206), he wished by all means to have it at once disappear. His own mind may not have yet become settled on that point and he wished no impulse in that direction to come from any other source than the voice of God in his own soul.

The first incident [6] in this miscellaneous collection is the very significant exorcism of a demon from a little "pagan" girl, accomplished without going into her pagan home, which would have been scandalous for a Jew,[7] and without having her brought into his presence. Soon after his arrival in the village it had become known, in spite of his precautions, that the famous Galilean Prophet and exorcist had come from Galilee. The mother of the little girl at once sought him out and appealed for help. She is described as a native of Syrian (not African) Phœnicia, Greek in her education and general viewpoint, not a Jewess either by race or religion. She gained entrance to

[3] Mk. VII:24.
[4] Mk. III:8.
[5] Mk. VI:14-16.
[6] Mk. VII:24-30.
[7] Acts X:25-28, XI:3.

the house, fell at Jesus' feet and in her desperate sorrow over the condition of her little daughter begged for help. Jesus objected to helping her on the ground that God's time for helping foreigners had not yet come. With his characteristic predilection for "parables," he said the children were now having their meal and that none of their food must be thrown to the little dogs who were watching them eat: "Let the children first be fed." The woman's quick wit, sharpened by her intense desire for help, seized upon the word "first." She said that small morsels sometimes fell to the little dogs under the table while the children were still eating! The spirit of the woman revealed by this statement led Jesus to make an exception to his general policy. He told her that the evil spirit had left her daughter. She hurried home and found the little girl thrown on the bed, probably exhausted after a final convulsion,[8] but in her right mind. This is unlike the cases recorded earlier in the Gospel in which Jesus worked directly by his presence and words on the minds of the demoniacs (pp. 87-89). The inference is that God gave him inner assurance of the little girl's cure as he made prayerful inquiry about her (pp. 84-86). Jesus seems to us to have dealt rather roughly with the woman in likening her and her class to little house dogs, even if such were often family pets. Perhaps he felt at first that he must not depart from the general policy that God had laid down for his work; he had not just now left Galilee in order to extend Jewish privileges to Gentiles and so still further to increase bitter scribal prejudice against him. He, therefore, dealt brusquely with her. He was evidently relieved to receive inner assurance from God that he might gratify his instinctive desire to relieve distress by making an exception to his general policy.

[8] *Cf.* Mk. IX:26.

The presentation of the matter made by Mark for his Gentile Christian clientage in and about Rome is one that would appeal to them. They had learned from Paul that the Gospel was "to the Jew first and also to the Greek." [9]

The incident is given a different treatment in the Matthew Gospel,[10] prepared for Jewish Christians who were still devoted to the idea of Jewish pre-eminence and to the law of Moses which they would have been glad to see Christians obey (pp. 13-17). Jesus seems more unwilling to act in the case. He refused even to speak to her: "he answered her not a word." His disciples are represented as present and urging him to do what she asked, but Jesus resisted even them with the definite statement that he had been sent only to "the lost sheep," the neglected classes, among the Jews. There is no implication that Gentile dogs may eat after Jewish children have "first" been fed. The children are called the "masters" of the dogs: it is Jews who will finally dominate the earth. Furthermore, the woman for whom Jesus finally consented to do the great favor is not an unmitigated Gentile. Though not a Jewish proselyte, she is by implication a Jehovah worshipper. She knows enough about Jewish religion to be able to call Jesus by a Messianic title, "Son of David," and it is her "faith," presumably in Jehovah or in Jesus as Jehovah's Messianic prophet, that furnishes Jesus with a sufficient pretext for action.

Jesus now goes back to the Sea of Galilee, but to its eastern shore which was not a part of Galilee. He reaches the sea, however, by a very circuitous route. He first goes a considerable distance directly away from it, north from Tyre to Sidon (unless this be regarded as a textual

[9] Rom. I:16.
[10] Mt. XV:22-28.

error for Saidon, that is, Beth-saida) and then southeast through the middle of the Ten City District, a region that lay mainly to the east and southeast of the Sea of Galilee. Nothing is said of what happened in these wide extra-Galilean wanderings except in one instance. Somewhere in the Decapolis a man was healed who had the two related ailments, deafness and defective speech. We might be inclined to think of this man as a foreigner like the woman of Syrian Phœnicia, and to suppose that Mark in all this section is representing Jesus as working among Gentiles. But on the other hand, if Mark was concerned to give the impression that this man was a Gentile we should surely expect him to mention the fact as he did in the case of the Phœnician woman. The whole Decapolis district had plenty of Jews in it.

This cure of deafness and defective speech was accomplished in an unusual way. It was not simply by a word or a touch, but by both and by the use of saliva. Furthermore, the prayer that we have assumed to be silently made by Jesus whenever he cured the sick (p. 85) is here open and evident. The reason for it may be found in Jesus' desire to develop in the man the "faith" that he emphasized as so essential to a cure. The man had had no opportunity to see Jesus perform cures and, being deaf, had not heard much about them. To create in the man a lively sense of expectation Jesus puts his fingers in the man's ears, as if to open them, touches his tongue with the saliva that is supposed to have curative value, heaves a deep sigh of sympathy, the motion of which the man can see, though he does not hear, and lifts his eyes to heaven, as the source from which Jesus' prayer is bringing help. Then the cure followed as usual. The "bond" of the man's tongue was loosed, perhaps the bond by which Satan had tied it as he was supposed to have tied down

the woman so that she could not straighten up.[11] If he had always been entirely deaf and unintelligible in speech it would seem that he would have had to learn gradually to talk, but the description of the case indicates either that he had always been able to hear and talk some, or else that this was some nervous trouble that had come upon him at an age when he had already learned to talk distinctly. Jesus took great pains to keep the cure secret. He took the man out of the city alone into the country and gave strict orders to the man's friends not to talk about it to anyone. Others would of course see that he was cured, but they need not know by whom. Mark gives no hint of Jesus' reason for wishing his part in it to be concealed. Perhaps he wished to have his reputation as a healer of disease abate so that he could come back later to his teaching with more hope of concentrating attention upon his message. He had been embarrassed in Galilee by his popularity as a healer. The man's friends did not follow Jesus' instructions and the event set all the country talking. It brought to mind all that they had heard about Jesus' work as a healer in Galilee, which had at an earlier time drawn many of them across the lake to Jesus in Galilee.[12] The popular verdict was a hearty dissent from that known to have been passed on Jesus' work by the Galilean scribes: "he hath done all things well; he maketh even the deaf to hear and the dumb to speak."[13] This language suggests the Messianic picture in Isaiah XXXV: 5-6 and must have seemed very significant to the preachers of the Gospel making period.

This private interview with the deaf man and his

[11] Lk. XIII:11, 16; Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 306.
[12] Mk. III:8.
[13] Mk. VII:37.

friends is followed, without any introductory explanation, by an account of a meal at which four thousand men ("besides children and women," Mt.) who have been for three days with Jesus are abundantly fed with seven bread cakes and a few fishes. This account may have been found by the collectors of Gospel material in the Decapolis. It is natural to suspect that this is simply another account of the meal already described, sufficiently different in the details which had been developed by the early preachers to make the compilers wrongly consider it the description of another occasion. It is sometimes said that Mark wishes to show Jesus to be doing here for Gentiles what he had previously done for Jews. But if this were true Mark would certainly have brought the point distinctly out. The mere fact that Jesus was at the time on the east side of the Sea of Galilee would not have made it evident to the Christians about Rome that the crowds were necessarily Gentile. The reason given for providing food is that after being with Jesus for three days they are hungry and far from food. They had evidently brought with them food enough of their own to last a considerable time, which throws some possible light on the amount of food available for the use of the people when the five thousand were fed after having been together for only a few hours. In the present account seven hampers [14] are mentioned instead of twelve baskets. Perhaps the fact that in the Jerusalem church later seven men were appointed to take the places of the Twelve in serving food at the Christian commons [15] led to the surmise that there must have been seven distributors here in place of the twelve who appeared in the earlier paragraph.

[14] The same word is used to describe the "basket" in which Paul was let down from the wall of Damascus, Acts IX:25.

[15] Acts VI:3.

There comes next in this series of miscellaneous incidents a short tense interview with Pharisees regarding which we should be glad to have more information.[16] These Pharisees appear at a place called "the parts of Dalmanutha" ("the borders of Magadan," Mt.), to which Jesus and his disciples had come by boat. Since they had reached it by boat taken on the eastern, Decapolis side of the lake, and since these Pharisees seem to know Jesus, it is natural to assume that this otherwise unmentioned place was on the western shore and that we here have Jesus touching Galilean soil again for a few hours. It is clear that Jesus was being inspected by these Pharisees and that he was deeply stirred by the interview: he is said to have groaned, or sighed deeply in spirit. The Pharisees, probably scribes of the Pharisees, had very possibly been watching Jesus through spies and when he landed at this obscure point they at once "came forth," presumably from Capernaum, and "put him to the test" on some point; they came forth "tempting him." They asked him for "a sign from heaven," apparently to serve as corroboration of some innovation in teaching or action. What new thing had Jesus said or done that should lead the scribes to make this challenge? His last contact with them before leaving Galilee had been when he took a public stand against their sacred traditional interpretation of the law (pp. 121-123). They perhaps feared now that he would again try to corrupt the people by renewing his public attack on the tradition. It may also be that they saw the same danger that we found some reason for suspecting Jesus to have seen, namely, that the people would begin to think him to be some sort of Messiah. If so, there was double reason for their challenge. If one so set against the sacred tradition should be led by his popularity

[16] Mk. VI:11-13.

to nurse a Messianic ambition the result would be calamitous. If he were coming back to Galilee to begin a campaign along such lines they would meet him at its very threshold with a defiant challenge. They would probably have accepted as a "sign from heaven" that which the rabbis often sought, a voice from heaven, or some startling physical phenomenon. Jesus' startling healings and exorcisms had been interpreted by them as a sign from hell![17] If Jesus had really increased the supply of bread and fish it would seem that this might have satisfied their desire. But they might still have contended that this had not happened before their eyes, and not in response to an appeal to heaven for endorsement of a definite point of teaching or conduct. Whatever their idea of a sign may have been, Jesus emphatically refused to give a sign.[18] His unusual agitation—"he signed deeply in his spirit"—may have been due to the fact that, as we have seen, he had once been tempted to expect from God some spectacular physical endorsement, preservation from harm in a leap from a temple pinnacle to the pavement below. There may have been some recurrence of this temptation now. Especially would this be so if Jesus in these days of wandering in the outland had been considering whether his profound sense of call to leadership must not involve assuming a

[17] Mk. III:22.

[18] In Lk. XI:29-32, Mt. XVI:4, XII:38-41, Jesus says that his preaching of repentance is the only sign they will get. It is a sign like that given to the citizens of Nineveh by Jonah's preaching of repentance, but greater, because "something greater than Jonah is here." In accord with the Mt. compiler's general tendency to find detailed fulfilments of prophecy, in one of his two references to Jonah he cites Jonah's being "three days and three nights" in the whale's belly as parallel to the Son of Man's being "three days and three nights in the heart of the earth," that is, in Hades. According to the Mt. narrative of the burial and resurrection Jesus was only two nights and a part of two days in the grave.

Messianic rôle of some sort. It may also be true that Jesus was always wishing men to adopt his ideals because these ideals seemed to them morally attractive, because they seemed to them to be *per se* right, and not because these ideals had behind them some physical force or arbitrary authority.

In close connection with the account of this interview is the record of a conversation between Jesus and his disciples in the boat as they were sailing away from the Galilean shore.[19] In this conversation Jesus showed great concern for his disciples. They seemed to him to be in serious danger. He solemnly warned them to "beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod." The disciples missed the point and thought that Jesus was criticizing them for having forgotten, in the excitement of the interview with the Pharisees, to lay in a stock of bread while they were on the Galilean shore. They understood him to be really saying: "You seem to have been afraid of the leaven that is used by the Pharisees in Herod's territory!" Jesus indignantly reproached them for stupidity. He asked them if they belonged to that hardened element in the nation whom he had previously described[20] as looking at things without seeing them and listening without hearing. "And they forgot to take bread; and they had not in the boat with them more than one loaf. And he charged them, saying, Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod." Then follows a conversation in which Jesus draws out from them the statistics regarding the two recent occasions when he had made a little bread suffice for thousands. If the theory suggested above (p. 215) be true then this conversation would be regarded as the

[19] Mk. VIII:14-21.
[20] Mk. IV:10-12.

transformation of a popular homiletical explanation into an utterance of Jesus. In any case the important question to be raised here is this: What was there in the situation of the twelve at this time that aroused the deep concern of Jesus? Leaven, or yeast, spreads—it is sometimes thought of as "hidden" and spreading without being seen—"leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal." What was there about the Pharisees and Herod that might spread into the lives of the Twelve and in some hidden way contaminate their character? The compiler of the Matthew Gospel was perplexed by the reference to Herod, and substituted "Sadducees" for "Herod." [21] He also explains that the contaminating influence was something in the "teaching" of the Pharisees and Sadducees but he does not explain what particular point it was in their teaching that the disciples were in danger of adopting. Luke in another connection quotes the warning as against "the leaven of the Pharisees" which he interprets as "hypocrisy." [22] He leaves it uncertain in what particular the disciples were in danger of becoming insincere. This passage in Mark is not the first one that has classed the Pharisees and Herod together. It has been previously said that "the Pharisees went out and straightway with the Herodians took counsel against him (Jesus) to destroy him." [23] They did not at that time openly proceed against Jesus. Both parties seem to have had in their hearts a spirit of desperate antagonism to him that for reasons of expediency they did not express in action. Something of this insincerity had perhaps appeared in the interview with the Pharisees that had just taken place on the seashore. They had appeared asking

[21] Mt. XVI:6.
[22] Lk. XII:1.
[23] Mk. III:6.

for a sign from heaven as if open to conviction. Herod, too, is described in Luke's Gospel as a tricky, insincere man. When certain Pharisees tried to drive Jesus out of Galilee on the ground that Herod was trying to kill him Jesus referred to him as a "fox": "There came to him certain Pharisees saying to him, Get thee out and go hence, for Herod would fain kill thee. And he said unto them, Go and say unto that fox," that Jerusalem has a monopoly of prophet killing.[24] In this view of the situation we should infer from Jesus' solemn warning that he detected among the Twelve a spirit of growing opposition to, or at least discontent with, himself although it was kept by them from any open expression. The grounds for such discontent are not hard to discover: he had failed to carry the religious leaders, scribes of the Pharisees; he had failed to organize his popular Galilean following in any effective form; he had run away from an incipient readiness to see in him a Messianic possibility (p. 204 f) and was now wandering about in the outland taking no decisive step, apparently afraid to face the Galilean scribes again; he had just now sailed away from them after a helplessly ineffective interview; there were no signs of the coming of the Kingdom. It is not strange that there should have been in the inner circle at this time the beginning of the discontent that finally fully possessed Judas and carried him over at a critical moment into the camp of the Pharisees, and of the priests who in Judæa corresponded politically to the Herodians of Galilee. Jesus soon took measures to bring this unsatisfactory situation to a head, to bring secret dissatisfaction out into the open where he could deal with it vigorously.

Before this action is described one other paragraph appears in these miscellaneous reminiscences of Jesus in

[24] Lk. XIII:31-32.

the northern and eastern outland. It describes the cure of a blind man, a cure accomplished with unusual difficulty, and by stages.[25] The gradualness of the cure may have corresponded to the gradual development of the man's faith. Here again, as in the case of the deaf man, the utmost pains were taken to keep the cure secret.

[25] Mk. VIII:22-26.

CHAPTER XXI

THE MESSIANIC SECRET

WHILE Jesus was still in the outland and avoiding large cities—"in the villages of Philip's Cæsarea"—he asked his disciples what seems to have been an unusual question, namely, who people in general were saying that he was.[1] It is not certain that all the disciples had been with him during all of this period of semi-concealment and comparative inactivity. Some of them from time to time may have visited their homes in Galilee and therefore been able to bring him a report of what had taken place in Galilee during his weeks or months of absence. They reported that he was still in favor with the people. The people believed his message about the nearness of the Kingdom. They felt that these were the "last days" of the present age, when ancient prophets would return to their people to prepare them for Jehovah's Great Day of Judgment. They regarded Jesus as the re-incarnation of some one of the old prophets. Some were saying that he was Jeremiah, others that he was Elijah, still others that the spirit of John the Baptist, recently executed, had entered his body and was using his lips and tongue for the continuation of the proclamation that Herod had interrupted. No one thought him to be the Messiah. If some had earlier surmised that he might turn out to be the Messiah, their surmise had subsided

[1] Mk. VIII:27-30, Mt. XVI:13-16.

below the Messianic level and he seemed to them only a great prophet of the last days: "And Jesus went forth, and his disciples, into the villages of Cæsarea Philippi: and on the way he asked his disciples, saying unto them, Who do men say that I am? And they told him, saying, John the Baptist; and others, Elijah; but others, One of the prophets."

Then Jesus, probing after any festering insincerity that he had recently suspected might be underneath the surface (p. 220), asked them the direct question, "Who do you say that I am?" One man, Peter, spoke out and said, "You are the Christ." Probably few of the others could have said it as heartily, and some could not have said it at all. Jesus did not deny what Peter had said but told them not to express this opinion to anyone outside the inner circle: "And he charged them that they should tell no man of him." [2]

At this point a number of important questions arise. Did Peter reach this conclusion for the first time now? If not, how long had he held it? Which one of the various types of current Messianic expectation did Peter have in mind when he declared his belief that Jesus was the Messiah? Did Jesus really think himself to be the Messiah and, if so, how long had he thought so; what type of Messiahship had he in mind; and to what extent did he foresee the details of his Messianic career? Have the Gospel data on these points been shaped by the experi-

[2] This is the natural meaning of the words. The compiler of the Gospel so understood them, as is evident from his subsequent narrative which constantly assumes that Jesus and his disciples agree in thinking him to be the Messiah (*e.g.*, Mk. X:35-40). If the words naturally meant "Jesus rebuked them for saying (that is, thinking) such a thing," the compiler would not have let them stand, but would have so altered them as to make them say what his narrative shows he felt they must have meant. *Cf.* Mt. XVI:13-20, Lk. IX:18-21.

ences and convictions of Christians who lived in the Gospel making period? That is, did the preachers and compilers of the Gospel present the history at this point as they felt, in view of subsequent occurrences, that it must have been, or did they simply reproduce unaltered very early sources that presented the situation as it really was? The answers to some at least of these questions are not unmistakably given in the sources. All that can be done is to attempt a reconstruction of the situation that shall account as satisfactorily as possible for such data as do appear in the Gospels and in the early history of the Christian movement. It will always be possible, of course, to challenge any such reconstruction at various points.

The Christ in popular thought was a personality belonging to the future, with a future career. Evidently nothing that Jesus had yet done seemed certainly Messianic; the popular verdict that he was Elijah or Jeremiah proves this. God was to choose and "anoint" his "Messiah," or "Anointed One." God might choose him from among men and thrust him out in some spectacular way at the proper time. Or God might choose him from among heavenly beings and introduce him among men in any one of various forms or even disguises.[3] Peter was evidently convinced that God had chosen Jesus for the Messianic career and would make the choice evident in the near future, at the time when the Kingdom should come. How he thought that God would do this does not appear—probably in some sudden spectacular way, perhaps by the arrival of an angelic host. It does not seem probable that Peter now for the first time reached the conclusion that Jesus was the Messiah elect. He would in the nature of the case have reached such a conclusion only after a good deal of thought, and there was less to encourage such

[3] Ascension of Isaiah X-XI.

thought now, than there had been earlier. This rather aimless and semi-fugitive wandering in the outland was not so well calculated to produce a Messianic surmise as the vigorous earlier activity in Galilee had been. The question of a possible Messianic career had never been openly discussed with Jesus.[4] He was known to have peremptorily discouraged the surmise when demoniacs had shouted out a wild proclamation of it. Now here in the outland in spite of all in the external situation that was adverse to a Messianic surmise Peter was still holding fast to an earlier opinion.

The probable working of Jesus' own mind is of course difficult to imagine. We have assumed that at the time of his baptism he felt laid upon him as "God's Son, the Beloved" the responsibility of leadership in a movement toward and into the Coming Kingdom of God; and that in the so-called "temptation" he decided upon certain general principles, acceptable to God, to be followed in the discharge of this responsibility; but that in these experiences it was not made clear to him that the acceptance of this responsibility involved adopting a "Messianic career" in any of the various forms in which that career was currently conceived, nor even in any new form orig-

[4] The Matthew Gospel, which largely ignores chronological movement and conceives the original situation less vividly than Mark, represents the disciples at an earlier time to have called Jesus to his face "God's Son" (XIV:33). It might possibly be contended that this meant simply an ethical sonship, but here in the Cæsarean conversation the Matthew Gospel makes Jesus assume that they already have recognized in him the Messianic Son of Man. "Who do men say that I the Son of Man am?" (or "that the Son of Man is"). The compiler of the Matthew Gospel works into matter from Q an earlier declaration of Messiahship by Jesus than Q as preserved in Lk. originally contained. The later, Fourth Gospel, proceeds still further than the Matthew Gospel in this direction and represents Peter to have known that Jesus was the Messiah before he ever met him (Jn. I:41).

inating in his own thought at the time. In the great humility of soul that had brought him into the Jordan waters with the multitude of John's penitents he was content to leave the Messianic career an open question to be answered for him by God in God's own time. In refusing at the time of the temptation to go to Jerusalem and call upon God for a spectacular Messianic endorsement of him at the temple, he laid aside Messianic ambition and proposed to wait for light from God—he would not 'tempt the Lord his God.' He had suppressed the outcry of demoniacs when they called him the Messiah; it was a recurrence of the temptation with which Satan, their master, had met him in the beginning. When John the Baptist in prison had sent messengers asking Jesus whether he felt himself to be the Messiah, Jesus had given an enigmatic reply which probably expressed his own uncertainty. He reported to John that he found himself able to do wonderful deeds such as were predicted in Isaiah's picture of the New Age, and he was probably conscious that they were done through the power of God. John must not be "stumbled" by them and attribute them to the power of Satan as the scribes had done. But he could not say that God meant him to be the Messiah.[5]

But now in the vicinity of Cæsarea he appears with a Messianic conviction and with a readiness to bring the question definitely up in the minds of the disciples. He has reached the conclusion that such sense of mission as God is sustaining within him can express itself in no other way than in some form of Messianic career. In no other way can the nation be made to understand what God would do through him. The concept "prophet," which meant much to the Jewish mind, was of too small dimensions to suit the growing sense of enlarging mission that

[5] Mt. XI:2-6, Lk. VII:18-23.

was more and more filling his soul. He must himself step forward to be in the New Age more than the loving son of God that he had learned to be in the Nazareth years, and more than that into which the Nazareth consciousness enlarged at baptism, the specially loved Son of God. "The Son of God, the Beloved" must accept a Messianic career.

The kind of prospective Messianic career toward which Jesus' mind turned found room for itself in the title "Son of Man." He began to speak of himself at once as "the Son of Man" in the Cæsarean conversation.[6] It was a title not unfamiliar to Jewish ears either in this form or in the related forms, the Man from Heaven, the Hidden Man, the Man from the Sea.[7] The career of the Messianic "Son of Man" was less definitely conceived than that of the "Son of David" (pp. 40-2). There was more room in it for unexpected and original Messianic experience. There is reason for supposing that the Son of Man type of Messiahship as it was conceived in Jewish thought appealed to Jesus before he felt sure that he must himself accept a Messianic career. He had perhaps sometimes spoken of the coming of the Son of Man without meaning at the time to designate himself by that title. It was an attractive conception of Messiahship because, as presented in the Book of Enoch, the Son of Man performed no military achievements, such as would be expected from the Son of David, the old warrior king. Instead he exalted righteousness, championed the poor, put down tyrants from their thrones, all by the power of God's Judgment Day glory, and thereafter shepherded the people in peaceful pursuits. The acceptance of this rôle marked an enlargement of Jesus' consciousness. It meant recognition of

[6] Mk. VIII:31.
[7] *Cf.* I Cor. XV:47, 4 Esd. XIII.

the fact that he would be the Judge of men, as well as the Leader under God of a World empire.

But at this point difficulty begins. The Son of Man from heaven was a being who, after having been long concealed with God, was to come suddenly with angels to the earth on Jehovah's great Judgment Day. He had no career on earth before the Judgment Day. How then could Jesus begin now before the Judgment Day to think of himself on earth as the Son of Man? Did he suddenly begin to remember an earlier life in heaven? If so how could his earthly life present the uncertainties and problems essential to the development of a real human character? If it be assumed that everything in Jesus' life was seen by him against the background of a distinctly remembered heaven, the logical conclusion would be the unreality of his earthly life, a popular heresy among the early Christians against which our Gospels were considered to be a vigorous protest. And how could the disciples at this time understand Jesus to be the Son of Man, since the Son of Man had no career on earth before the Judgment Day? It is possible of course to solve this problem by simply saying that Jesus never did call himself the Son of Man. It was his disciples who after his death reached the conclusion that he had been the Son of Man. The development of their thought would have proceeded in this way: Jesus in his lifetime had finally felt and declared himself to be the Messiah. He had, however, died and ascended into the heavens without doing what the Messiah was expected to do. He would, therefore, come from heaven to do it later. The kind of Messiah who comes from heaven is the Son of Man. Therefore, contrary to all expectation the Son of Man in the person of Jesus had appeared on the earth before the Judgment Day. In creating the Gospel narrative, therefore, the Gospel mak-

ers would naturally refer to Jesus as the Son of Man, and would necessarily assume that in declaring himself to be the Messiah he had known himself to be the Son of Man. Before resorting to this theory an effort ought to be made to work out the supposition that Jesus did think himself to be the Son of Man as the Gospels represent. If this supposition should be found unworkable the other is available as an alternative.

So far as the disciples are concerned a natural enough supposition would be that when they heard him call himself the Son of Man, they conceived the Son of Man to have entered the body of Jesus before the Judgment Day, just as the spirit of John the Baptist after his death was thought by Herod to have entered the body of Jesus. It might perhaps seem that the disciples would have felt such awe in the supposed presence of the Spirit of the Heavenly Son of Man as to make intercourse with Jesus constrained and artificial, but those to whom devils and angels were a matter of course and a subject of daily conversation probably found devils less fearsome and angelic beings less awesome than we moderns would suppose. Even modern Christians find themselves able to associate unconstrainedly with persons whose bodies are thought to be the "temples" of so august a being as the Holy Ghost is theologically considered to be.

It may be that Jesus himself by a logical process reached the conclusion that the Spirit of the Son of Man had taken possession of him. We have discovered him feeling a profound sense of reverence for the Holy Spirit within him, through whose power he found himself able to expel demons from men (p. 86). He might in the same way have found the most rational interpretation of his own high sense of mission and responsibility in connection with the Kingdom of God, finally conceived as Messianic,

to be the assumption that the Spirit of the Son of Man was within him. Such an assumption would not have involved any personal remembrance of a previous existence in heaven. The modern mind does not work easily under the pre-suppositions of the ancient Jewish thought world, but we must be ready to let Jesus think as a Jew of the first century would be expected to think, using the modes of thought and the pre-suppositions characteristic of the world in which he lived. To try to make him think in the terms and modes of thought natural to the twentieth century could result only in making his life in his own day an unreal human life, and this would be simply to repeat in modern form the great heresy that the early church with such difficulty cast off. As will be seen later, Jewish pre-suppositions were merely the incidents of his religious experience, not its essential features.

The Matthew Gospel at this point contains a paragraph peculiar to itself in which Jesus expresses enthusiastic appreciation of Peter for the recognition of his Messiahship.[8] Peter's insight and loyalty, Jesus says, can be due to nothing less than the touch of God upon his soul. No man, "flesh and blood," could have given him such true vision in these dark days. With a play upon the word "Peter" Jesus says that he has found in Peter (Petros) solid rock (petra) on which to build his new "congregation." The Greek word "ekklesia," translated "church," might better be translated "congregation," meaning the nation conceived as a religious body. The Jewish people led by God through the Sinaitic wilderness constituted the "ekklesia," "church," or "congregation," in the wilderness.[9] It is the word found in the Greek translation of the

[8] Mt. XVI:17-19.

[9] Acts VII:38. The word was later adopted by the Christians as the name of their organization. The compiler of Matthew was probably conscious of its double meaning here,—"nation" and "church."

Old Testament Messianic passage, much used by the early Christians, Deut. XVIII: 15 ff., where it describes the assembly of the nation at the foot of Mt. Sinai promising to do the will of God. What Jesus now says is that he has discovered a foundation man on whom to build the new nation, the true Israel, of which he himself will be the Messianic head in the New Age of the Coming Kingdom: "upon this rock I will build my Israel." In the development of the American colonies when George Washington appeared, there was a foundation on which to build the new nation. The words present the conception congenial to the section of the church in which the Matthew Gospel was compiled, a reformed, Christian Jewish nation gathering into itself proselytes from all other nations (XXVIII: 19-20) and dominating the world. Of this nation Jesus will be the Messianic King and Peter his first subordinate official. All of the Twelve will hold high offices, acting as chieftains over the twelve tribes of the New Israel,[10] but Peter will be above the others. To him will be given the "keys" of the Kingdom as a general symbol of authority,[11] and particularly of authority to admit men into the Kingdom. In the next sentence Jesus goes on to emphasize this latter species of authority. Peter will be the authoritative religious teacher, setting up proper standards of admission, determining how the commandments of the Mosaic law are to be applied to Gentile converts who will seek admission into the Jewish Messianic world empire. Whenever Peter shall make anyone of these commandments "bind," that is, apply to a given situation, his verdict will be final; whenever he "looses," that is, pronounces a commandment inapplicable, there will be liberty to disregard

[10] Mt. XIX:28.
[11] *Cf.* Is. XXII:22.

it. The scribes now presume to exercise this function. They gather about the gateway into the Kingdom of God, keys in hand, and shut it before men.[12] But Jesus, the Messianic head of the Kingdom, has given this power to his apostle Peter. The authority to "bind" and "loose" the commandments of the Mosaic law is later conferred by Jesus upon the Twelve in exactly the same language used here in conferring it upon Peter.[13] Probably in the source used by the compiler of the Gospel the sentence occurred only as a commission to all the apostles.[14] It was repeated by the compiler in reference to Peter alone perhaps because he wished to emphasize for his readers the fact that Peter rather than Paul was the true authority on this point.[15] In any case there was no thought of any "successors" of Peter or of any of the other

[12] Mt. XXIII:13. "Woe unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because ye shut the Kingdom of Heaven before men." The verb translated "shut" means to lock with a key, "kleis," keys, "kleio," to shut.

[13] Mt. XVIII:18. With emphasis upon the power to admit into, or exclude from, the "church," a power logically involved in the power to interpret God's commandments.

[14] Perhaps it was a part of Q omitted by Lk. because "binding" and "loosing" were terms unfamiliar to Gentile readers.

[15] The passage seems like a reminiscence of the situation in Syrian Antioch, where Peter and Paul had been in sharp conflict over the question of how much liberty Christians might exercise in their relation to the Mosaic food laws. We know from Gal. II:11-14 that the feeling was very tense. Paul and Peter contended in an open meeting and party lines were sharply drawn between the partisans of each. It is probable that these parties continued for some decades, and with more hard feeling than had originally existed among the leaders. The Jewish Christians of this region, among whom the Matthew Gospel was very possibly compiled (p. 16), would be glad to seize upon any appreciation of Peter expressed by Jesus and would have felt justified in so shaping it as to make it support their contention that Peter and not Paul was the true authority in determining the proper application of the Mosaic law to the conduct of Christians. They felt perfectly sure that this would have been the verdict of Jesus.

apostles. The whole conception embodied in the passage rests upon the pre-supposition that the Kingdom of God, the New Israel, will soon come in the form of the New Age, and in this New Age there will be no death and consequently no need of "apostolic successors." The God of the present age, Satan, is against the Kingdom but he and his officials, sitting in the gates of Hades,[16] will not prevail against it. They will not be able to swallow it up in their dark realm of death or oblivion.

The reason why Jesus wished to conceal from the public his new consciousness of being the Messianic Son of Man was the fact, soon to be considered, that he had developed a conception of the Messianic career very unlike that commonly held by the people. He did not wish to be thought of as Messiah until his conception of Messiahship should be understood. If so popular a prophet had publicly anounced himself as the Messiah, crowds would have flocked to him expecting from him the various things that they naturally expected from the Messiah. His inevitable failure to meet this expectation would have produced bitter disappointment and a feeling of resentment that would have shut their minds against his religious teaching. Furthermore such a proclamation by such a prophet would have created a popular excitement that would have brought Roman soldiers at once into action. Their presence would have roused the fighting spirit among a people always ready for revolt. It was uncompromising disapproval of such a program that had kept Jesus out of the Judas revolutionary movement. The only possible way for him to proceed was to keep his Messianic consciousness the secret of the inner circle until God should act in some notable way.

[16] Oriental officials held court in the gates of the city; the Turkish government has been "The Sublime Porte."

CHAPTER XXII

THE PROSPECTIVE SUFFERING OF THE SON OF MAN

WHILE the disciples, excited by Peter's bold declaration of belief that Jesus would turn out to be God's Messiah, were some of them wondering whether they could agree with him, Jesus introduced a new and utterly disconcerting idea. He said that it was necessary in the plan of God for him, as Messianic Son of Man, to be condemned and executed by the supreme court of the nation, an action in which there would be agreement on the part of the often discordant elements constituting the court, Sadducean high priests, Pharisaic scribes and other dignitaries. His execution would be followed after three days (on the third day, Mt., Lk.) by his resurrection.[1]

The idea of a violent Messianic death seems to have been unknown in Jewish theology. There were those who expected the Messiah to die a natural death after a long reign, but none expected him to be killed by enemies, much less by enemies among his own people. The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah which has seemed to Christian theology to be filled with the idea of a Messianic death seemed to Jewish theologians to teach that for the Messiah's sake and in response to his entreaties God forgives Israel. Not the Messiah but Israel, in exile, was

[1] Mk. VIII:31-38.

referred to in the eighth verse: "By oppression and judgment he was taken away; and as for his generation who among them considered that he was cut off out of the land of the living for the transgression of my people to whom the stroke was due." The Messiah's work of redeeming Israel from foreign rule, restoring Israel as the people of God, and establishing Israel's dominion over the nations is accomplished, according to old Palestinian theology, without the expiating sufferings and death of the Messiah.[2] Justin Martyr in the second century A.D. represents a Jew as recognising that the Christ must suffer, though not the shameful death of crucifixion, but this admission may have been produced by Justin's argument with him or by the influence of Christianity on the synagogue.[3]

Jesus is said to have presented the idea "openly," "without reserve," that is, not in the veiled parable form that he so often used. Peter at once, in private or semi-private conversation remonstrated with him. Peter knew the doubtful mood of his fellow disciples. They were not all in agreement with his own great conviction. The misgivings that Jesus had suspected to be concealed in their hearts (p. 220) had perhaps been openly expressed by them to Peter. He was certain that the effect of such an announcement by Jesus would be disastrous. Peter's readiness to remonstrate with one whom he recognized as the Messiah elect shows that his conception of Messiahship did not eliminate the possibility of a Messianic blunder. To him the Messiah was a king and he himself, according to the Matthew Gospel, was prime minister. A capable prime minister might be able to set his royal master right in an error of judgment. This might be

[2] Weber, *Die Lehren des Talmud*, p. 346.
[3] *Dialogue with Trypho a Jew*, 68, 89, 90.

Peter's view of the case even if he thought that the Spirit of the heavenly Son of Man was in Jesus. To the Jewish mind angelic beings, like the Son of Man, were amenable to reason. Even a man whose body is the "temple" of so august a being as the Holy Spirit of God would be subject to advice and remonstrance. Jesus vigorously resented Peter's interference. He had reached his conviction, as we shall soon see, in a way that made it seem to him the voice of God in his soul. Peter was thinking as low level men think, and not in the high and wise way of God's eternal counsel. Jesus had evidently reached his conclusion after painful inner conflict, in which Satan had perhaps seemed to stand in his way as at the beginning. And now in his usual rôle of deceiver, Satan is again on the field making subtle use of Peter. "And Peter took him and began to rebuke him. But he turning about and seeing his disciples rebuked Peter and says, Get thee behind me, Satan, for thou thinkest not the thoughts of God but the thoughts of men."

In order to enter as fully as possible into the situation presented here it is necessary to try to discover exactly what Jesus said to his disciples and what they understood by it. The prediction of death and resurrection is very compact and explicit. It is twice repeated later as an almost stereotyped formula.[4] The details specified in the last prediction—mocking, spitting on him, scourging—sound as if they were inserted in the prediction because the narrator knew that as a matter of fact they had been features of the trial. When the Gospel makers gave literary form to the prediction Jesus was known to have made, they naturally made the prediction conform as nearly as possible to these actual facts. There is also indication that in a more significant matter they shaped the

[4] Mk. IX:31, X:32-34.

prediction to the actual occurrence, namely, a personal resurrection three days after his execution. If Jesus had really predicted his personal resurrection at the end of such a literal three-day period, it is hard to see why his disciples after his execution were not eagerly expecting it instead of refusing to believe it when it was reported to them. This suggests that what Jesus really told his disciples was that he was to be executed in Jerusalem but that soon after his execution he would re-appear in some connection with the general resurrection, which in the thought of many was connected with the inauguration of the New Age, or the Coming Kingdom. Jesus presumably talked at some length with his disciples about his death and resurrection and in the course of such conversation perhaps referred to a passage in the prophecy of Hosea that fitted the times in which they were living. It described a decadent Israel, like that to be found at this time in the religious leadership of the people, such a decadent Israel as an Isaiah passage had been earlier used by Jesus to describe (p. 189). In this Hosea passage, after a dramatic description of national decadence, occurs the prediction of a national resurrection, or revival, on the third day, evidently not the third of three literal week days, but the third day considered as the close of a brief appropriate time decided upon by God:[5] "Come let us return unto Jehovah; for he hath torn and he will heal us; he hath smitten and he will bind us up. After two days he will revive us; on the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live before him."[6] On this supposition the reason

[5] Jesus elsewhere used the expression in this sense: "Behold I cast out demons and perform cures today and tomorrow and the third day I am perfected. Nevertheless I must go on my way today and tomorrow and the day following," Lk. XIII:32-33.

[6] Hos. VI:1-2. It is evident from I Cor. XV:4, "raised on the third day according to the scriptures," that the early Christians

for the incredulity of the disciples when Jesus' resurrection was reported to them is clear enough. They had not expected anything to happen on the third of three twenty-four hour days. If they had thought of a literal resurrection they had probably thought of it as to occur in some spectacular form just precedent to, or as a part of, the glorious general resurrection. The mere report of an empty grave, which appears in the oldest source, would not have been sufficiently impressive to appeal to the apocalyptic expectation. Furthermore, the whole idea of the glorious Son of Man experiencing a resurrection from the dead was incredible. This accounts for their "questioning among themselves what the rising again from the dead should mean," on one occasion when Jesus referred to the resurrection of the Son of Man.[7] There was nothing particularly mysterious to the Jewish mind either in the resurrection of an individual or in the general resurrection. But it seemed inconceivable to them that the Son of Man, who belonged in heaven and was expected to come to earth from heaven, should ever descend into the realm of the dead and come up from that dark abode either in an isolated personal resurrection or in the general resurrection.

It may also be that when Jesus began to talk about his prospective death and resurrection in Jerusalem, Peter and any other of the Twelve who agreed with him in thinking Jesus to be the Messiah, did not understand Jesus to mean that he really would be killed. They may have thought that this was another "parable," some obscure reference to a withdrawal from public life to be followed by a sudden emergence from retirement, at which time

found evidence in the scriptures for believing that Jesus was raised on the third day.

[7] Mk. IX:9-10.

the general resurrection and inauguration of the Kingdom would occur. In that case Peter's strong desire to stop such talk was because he feared that some of the Twelve might not realize that it was only a parable. Any such who did not believe him to be the Messiah, but only more or less of a prophet, would then consider his newly disclosed Messianic consciousness to be a pure illusion that utterly discredited him—another indication that his family were right in thinking him to be one who sometimes lost his mental balance (p. 119).

How did Jesus reach the conclusion that a violent death was an inevitable feature of the Messianic career of the Son of Man? We might be inclined to say that Jesus' natural insight into the situation enabled him to see that the enmity of the scribes and priests would inevitably result in his execution. But on the other hand he might more naturally have reasoned that the all powerful God would certainly protect his Christ and defeat every possible combination of human enemies. The very idea of a Messianic Judgment involved the overthrow of all the enemies of God and his Christ. A clue to the working of Jesus' mind is found in his reference to the scriptures: "How is it written of the Son of Man that he should suffer much and be set at nought?" [8] The idea of suffering and being set at nought suggests the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. It may be, as is often said, that Jesus had combined the picture of the Suffering Servant of Jehovah in Isaiah with the Son of Man idea. We may infer that Jesus had also studied the twenty-second Psalm, a Messianic Psalm which in vs. 27-28 almost uses the phrase "Kingdom of God," and the first half of which describes a victim undergoing torture. The first sentence of this Psalm is said to have been heard from Jesus' lips

[8] Mk. IX:12.

during the crucifixion: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me."[9] But what led Jesus to make such an unprecedented exegesis of the scriptures? It seems probable that the impetus was found in his own inner experience. We have seen that the dominant feature of his inner life was conscious contact with the living will of God. He felt the will of God rising within him for the healing of disease, for the forgiveness of sin, for friendly social relations with publicans and sinners. It is to be supposed also that he felt the undercurrent of pain that runs through the will of God in its close contact with the selfishness of man. As the consciousness of God pressed upward within his own consciousness he felt as God felt about the unreadiness of men for the unselfish life of the Kingdom. This was a heavy burden that rested upon him as it rested upon God. God wrought in him the deepening conviction that such unselfish ideals as he presented to the nation could be realized only as the Messianic Leader entered into the suffering of God. The reaching of this conclusion must have been a profound religious experience that stirred Jesus to the depths of his great nature. In some circles of Jewish thought, contemporary or nearly contemporary with Jesus, the suffering of righteous individuals was believed to bring good to the nation. It had introduced the glorious Maccabean age.[10]

[9] Mk. XV:34.

[10] It is said in IV Maccabees (I:7-12), produced in the Alexandrian ghetto, that the notable martyr death of Eleazar, the old scribe, the seven brothers and their mother in the Maccabean period, served to purify the country. Their death cleansed the fatherland and was a "ransom" ("anti-psuchon") for the nation's sin. Through the "propitiation" ("hilasterion") of their death divine providence saved the people (XVII:21-22). When Eleazar was being burned to death he prayed: "Thou, O God, knowest that though I might save myself, I am dying by fiery torments for thy law. Be merciful unto thy people and let our punishment be a satisfaction in their

Jesus too felt that it was not only the suffering of the Son of Man but the suffering of many of his followers that was required for the inauguration of the Kingdom of God. Every follower must shoulder his cross and stand in procession behind the Leader in the line of those proceeding to the place of execution. This last statement was made, according to Mark, not to the inner circle of disciples only, but to the people at large. "And he called unto him the multitude with his disciples and said, If any man would come after me let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me." [11] If Jesus was influenced by the thought of the Suffering Servant of Jehovah found in Isaiah, he may have considered the Servant to be that element in the nation that brought redemption to others by its suffering. In accordance with such an idea he would naturally call upon all willing ones in the nation to join him, the Leader, in redemptive suffering for others, not only for other Jews but for other nations, for the Messianic idea in its best Jewish forms assigned a place in the Kingdom to aliens (pp. 44 f). Jesus' statement to the multitudes was not a disclosure to them of his Messianic consciousness. To them he was the great prophet of the last days calling upon the willing ones among the people to join him in a death that should bring in the Coming Kingdom. Anyone who should shrink from sacrificing his present physical life in martyrdom for this great cause would lose the blessed life of the

behalf. Make my blood their purification and take my soul to ransom ("anti-psuchon") their souls" (VI:29). In an earlier Alexandrian document (II Maccabees, first century B.C. ?) one of the seven martyr brothers is made to say that they are giving body and soul for their fathers' laws, calling on God to show favor to the nation soon and to let his wrath, justly fallen on the whole of the nation, end in their death (VII:37-38). This great sacrifice was followed by the glorious period of Maccabean independence.

[11] Mk. VIII:34.

Kingdom in the New Age. This would be an incalcuable loss, for what advantage would there be in gaining the whole world in the present age and thereby losing a position in the blessed life of the Coming Age. (Is Jesus here thinking of the time when he was tempted to do this, and did he describe his own temptation to the inner circle during these days?) Whoever among the people shall be ashamed (like Peter?) of Jesus' words presenting the prospect of death, and ashamed to follow Jesus the prophet to an apparently ignominious but really glorious death will find in the Judgment Day that the Messianic Son of Man will be ashamed of him.[12] If Jesus really used the title Son of Man here, he was not understood by the public to be referring to himself as the Son of Man. Only the members of the inner circle understood that he meant himself, or himself already possessed by the Spirit of the Son of Man.

At this point in Mark a new utterance is introduced by the words "And he said unto them." It is, therefore, uncertain whether this utterance was made to "the multitude" or to the inner circle alone: "And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, There are some here of them that stand by, who shall in nowise taste of death until they see the kingdom of God come with power."[13] This utterance raises a new question to be considered in the next chapter.

[12] Mk. VIII:35-38.

[13] Mk. IX:1, "see the Kingdom present," or "arrived," perfect participle; Mt. XVI:28, "see the Son of Man coming in his Kingdom"; Lk. IX:27, "see the Kingdom of God."

CHAPTER XXIII

HOW AND WHEN JESUS EXPECTED THE KINGDOM OF GOD TO COME

THE saying of Jesus quoted at the end of the last chapter is the first one found in the oldest Gospel which definitely raises the double question, How and when did Jesus expect the Kingdom of God to come? Did he expect some sudden breaking in of the heavenly world at a definite time, "the Son of Man coming in the glory of his Father with the holy angels" at the end of the present age to call all men before him in Judgment and begin a New Age? And if so, how soon did he expect this "cataclysm," or "eschatological" [1] event to occur?

These two questions are of minor importance compared with the great question, *What* is the Kingdom of God? *What* is it that is to come? A person who looks forward to entering "heaven" at death is not nearly so much concerned to know the year and day of his death and the nature of the experience called "death" as he is to have at least some clear general idea of the essential character of the life in heaven which he must be prepared to live. The essential nature of that Kingdom which Jesus expected to come has been seen in the chapters on the

[1] Having to do with the "eschata," or "last things," that is, things at the end of the "present age," or "world," but including things now going on in the unseen heavenly world, the breaking in of whose life into the earth will terminate the "present age."

righteousness of the Kingdom. By far the largest part of his teaching is concerned with this subject and not with these minor questions. The Kingdom was to be a world civilization in which honesty and friendliness in personal life and social institutions would be made universal and secure, a civilization in which all men as sons of God, the Heavenly Father, would work together in a powerful, true and faithful brotherhood at all the varied tasks to be set for them by the unfolding will of God. Jesus' clear vision of what ought to be, and sometime surely would be, was a general ideal the details of which fortunately each generation has been left to work out for itself in the terms peculiar to its own period in the evolution of human thought and life. It has provided the goal toward which each generation of those to whom it has come in the course of Christian history has been left to press earnestly on in its own best way. The questions how and when this goal is to be reached could largely be left to answer themselves in the course of developing human life.

Is there any evidence as to the way in which Jesus in his own day answered them? There is clear evidence as to the way in which Jesus was supposed by the early Christians to have answered the question, *how* the Kingdom of God would come. They supposed of course that their own answer was in accord with the thought of Jesus; otherwise they would not have given it. Their own answer was twofold. In the first place they expected a sudden breaking in of the New Age. This appears in Paul: "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold I tell you a mystery: we shall not all sleep (die), but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump;

for the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." [2]

It is clear that the Christians among whom the Synoptic Gospels were compiled also looked for a sudden end of the present age. In unmistakable terms they attributed this view to Jesus. He is represented to have said: "But in those days after that tribulation (the destruction of Jerusalem), the sun shall be darkened and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall be falling from heaven, and the powers that are in the heavens shall be shaken. And then shall they see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory. And then shall he send forth the angels, and shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven." [3] It was almost inevitable that the early Christians should expect such a sudden beginning of the New Age. The present age had begun suddenly by the fiat of God, as they read their Bibles. God had said, "Let there be light; and there was light." [4] So also heavenly light breaking instantaneously in, "in the twinkling of an eye," by the fiat of God would constitute the beginning of the New Age. How else could the New Age begin! The modern idea of transition by development was not in the Palestinian Jewish mind, however conceivable such an idea might perhaps have been in certain spheres of Greek thought. It is sometimes said that Jesus held no such view; it was simply attributed to him as a matter of course by the early Christians. The modern unreadiness to ascribe such a view to Jesus is due to the fact that the view is supposed to involve the impossible assumption that character can be the product

[2] I Cor. XV:50-52.
[3] Mk. XIII:24-27, Mt. XXIV:29-31, Lk. XXI:25-27.
[4] Gen. I:3.

of a fiat instead of a growth. Jesus, it is inferred, must have realized this impossibility or else been lacking in moral insight. However, the eschatological view is not at all inconsistent with the idea of the development of individual character. It means simply a sudden change in environment and the physical adaptation of personality to the new environment. A child may be taken out of the slums and established in a refined Christian home within half an hour but this "cataclysmic" change in environment does not eliminate the need and possibilty of subsequent growth. Even if the eschatological idea should involve some sudden change in character, such change need not be thought to eliminate development. If there be such a thing as instantaneous conversion, a sudden radical change in character, it must be followed by a long period of development. But did Jesus actually hold the eschatological view? The fact that it was possible for the early Christians unhesitatingly to attribute it to him is proof that at least he never denied it. If he held another view he evidently did not think it worth while to make that fact clear.

But the eschatological view of the manner in which the Kingdom would come was not the whole of the early Christian thought upon the subject. Although Paul believed that flesh and blood could not inherit the Kingdom of God and that the Kingdom would come in the twinkling of an eye at some future time, still the presence of the Spirit of God, or the Spirit of Christ, in the Christian cult meeting and in the hearts of believers, really constituted the beginning of the life of the New Age and might on occasion be called the Kingdom of God: "The Kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." [5]

[5] Rom. XIV:17.

A similar idea prevailed in the circles in which the Synoptic Gospels were compiled. In the teachings attributed by them to Jesus, besides the considerable number of passages that speak of the Kingdom as introduced by a future cataclysm, are some others that speak of it as a present fact persisting in an uncataclysmic way. In these passages it appears that wherever Jesus was experiencing within him the mighty power of God, and especially later the mighty power of the Spirit of the Heavenly Son of Man, commissioned to establish the future cataclysmic Kingdom, and gathering disciples about him ready for its future life, there he felt that in some sense the Kingdom had already come in a quiet inconspicuous way. This idea is probably not to be found in certain parables often cited as instances of it (p. 194) but rather in such a passage as that reporting his view of John the Baptist's relation to the Kingdom. He speaks of John, greater than any prophet and unsurpassed by any sort of man of the past, as nevertheless not in the Kingdom of God: "But wherefore went ye out? to see a prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet. . . . Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist; yet he that is but little in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than he." [6] Jesus cannot have thought of John the Baptist as excluded from the future Kingdom in which all the righteous dead would participate.[7] Therefore it must have been in some present form of the Kingdom that John was not found. In this context he is represented as not being among the disciples of Jesus. His eyes had not been opened. He was simply able to say: "Art thou he that cometh (prophet or Christ) or look

[6] Mt. XI:9-11, Lk. VII:26-28.
[7] Mt. VIII:11.

we for another?" [8] Or if possibly Jesus' comment on John was made after his death then John had been removed by death from the present Kingdom. In another place Jesus said to the scribes that his ability to exorcise demons by the power of God's Spirit ("finger" Lk.) was proof that the Kingdom of God had come upon them: "If I by the Spirit of God am casting out demons, then the Kingdom of God has come to you." [9] Driving the demons back to the abyss was the first step in the Judgment that would end this Satan-controlled age and bring in the Kingdom in its future cataclysmic form.

In a passage peculiar to Matthew, Jesus is represented as recognizing an uncataclysmic form of the Kingdom in which good and bad live undisturbed together. Finally in the future eschatological stage of the Kingdom, the wicked will be collected by angels *"out of* the Kingdom." That is, the place where they had previously been was in some sense the Kingdom: "The Son of Man shall send forth his angels and they shall gather out of his Kingdom all things that cause stumbling and them that do iniquity." [10] In a passage, found in Luke only, Jesus is represented as saying to a group of Pharisees (presumably hostile as usual) that the Kingdom of God was "in their midst." They had asked him when the Kingdom of God would come, apparently expecting from him some specification of significant preliminary events, "signs of the Kingdom." Jesus replied that the coming of the Kingdom would not be detected by the careful observation of preliminary signs, for it was already in their midst. "And being asked by the Pharisees when the Kingdom of God

[8] Mt. XI:3, Lk. VII:20.

[9] Mt. XII:28, Lk. XI:20.

[10] Mt. XIII:41. Is the Kingdom of the Son of Man here distinguished from the future "Kingdom of their Father" (v. 43) in which the righteous shine after judgment? *Cf.* I Cor. XV.

cometh, he answered them and said, The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, There! for lo, the Kingdom of God is in your midst." [11] The presence of Jesus, filled with the inner sense of being borne powerfully on by the will of God to establish the New Order and surrounded by a group of disciples, constituted an uncataclysmic presence of the Kingdom of God. Luke in the same context represents Jesus as proceeding to speak to his disciples of a future time when they will look back, longing in vain for one of these days when the Son of Man brought the Kingdom into their midst, and be obliged to comfort themselves with expectation of the future Kingdom to be introduced by a Judgment as catastrophic as the flood.[12]

The question, *when* Jesus expected the Kingdom to come, has been partly answered in discussing *how* he expected it to come. He carried the Kingdom with him, as a present fact and he also looked forward to a future manifestation of the Kingdom, sudden and glorious, at "the consummation of the age." *When* did he think that this future manifestation of the Kingdom would be made? It is evident that the first Christians expected it to be soon. Paul saw a certain program of preliminary events, described by him in two quite different ways,[13] but this program, according to the very epistles in which it is presented, seemed to him one that might be

[11] Lk. XVII:3. The Greek might be translated "within you," but in this context that translation is less suitable. The Kingdom of God was not within the Pharisees to whom Jesus was talking. Furthermore "within you" would mean a state of heart at peace with God, and that Jesus did not mean simply this by the phrase is evident from the fact that he considered John the Baptist, whose heart was certainly at peace with God, as outside the Kingdom.

[12] XVII:22-37.

[13] Rom. IX-XI, II Thess. II:1-12.

carried out in his own lifetime.[14] This same sense of the immediacy of the coming Kingdom seems to have prevailed in the circles in which the Synoptic Gospels were produced. In their report of the teaching of Jesus about the Kingdom the urgent need of immediate action is emphasized. Definite indications of time are few. In a passage peculiar to Luke Jesus, just before his last arrival in Jerusalem, is reported to have spoken a parable teaching that the great demonstration would not be made within the next few days as his disciples had apparently supposed it might be: "He spake a parable because he was nigh to Jerusalem and because they supposed that the Kingdom of God was immediately to appear." [15] In an enigmatic utterance, found in the Matthew Gospel only, he said to his disciples at the time when the Twelve were sent out into Galilee to preach the nearness of the Kingdom, that they would be compelled to flee from city to city, but that the Son of Man would come before they had exhausted all the possible places of refuge: "When they persecute you in this city, flee into the next; for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of Man be come." [16] This whole discourse, as was said earlier, is apparently a composite of teachings, some of them applicable to a situation that had not yet arisen. This particular sentence seems to indicate a situation existing a little before and after the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70, when Christians were being persecuted in Palestine but had not been driven from its borders. The Christian preachers of that period, the period within which the Matthew Gospel was compiled, found some utterance among the words

[14] Rom. XIII:11-14, II Thess. I:5-10.
[15] Lk. XIX:11.
[16] Mt. X:23.

of Jesus which they interpreted as applying to their situation and perhaps somewhat modified into conformity with their eager hope. In connection with the sending out of the Twelve Jesus may have said something about the nearness of the Messianic demonstration to be made by the Son of Man (though not at that time openly designating himself by the title) which later took the form in which we have it. There are really only two explicit designations of time attributed to Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels and the extent to which these have been shaped by the presuppositions of the early Christians it is impossible to tell. In the first, after picturing the destruction of Jerusalem, he says that soon after (Mt. "immediately," Mk. "in those days") the Son of Man will appear coming in clouds with great power and glory. He then proceeds to say that the present generation will certainly not pass away until all these things have happened, although the exact day and hour of the great event even he does not know; it is God's secret. "Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, until all these things be accomplished. Heaven and earth shall pass away but my words shall not pass away. But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father. Take ye heed, watch and pray; for ye know not when the time is." [17]

Another apparently explicit designation of time is the one referred to at the end of the last chapter. "And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, There are some of them that stand by, who shall in nowise taste of death, till they see the Kingdom of God come with power." How-

[17] Mk. XIII:30-33, Matt. XXIV:34-39, Lk. XXI:31-36. It is sometimes said that "all these things" which are to happen in this generation designates only the destruction of Jerusalem, but against this view is the word "immediately" and the phrase "in those days," Mt. XXIV:29, Mk. XIII:24.

ever, the context makes it possible to suppose that the compiler saw in these words a reference to something else than the coming of the Son of Man at the end of the age. Jesus had been saying that this coming of the Kingdom at the end of the age could be brought to pass only after, and in consequence of, the death of the Son of Man and his disciples.[18] Now he seems to say that certain favored persons, before they take their share in this Messianic death which is to bring in the Kingdom, will in some special sense see the Kingdom of God present "in power," that is, in its ultimate radiant, eschatological form (not in the quiet way in which he was beginning to feel that he always carried it with him). That this is what the words meant to the compilers of the Gospels is indicated by what immediately follows. Jesus selects the three disciples, Peter, James and John, who in the thought of the early preachers would most certainly be the ones to experience any such special favor, takes them up into a mountain (for a night of prayer, Lk.), and there lets them see the heavenly glory of the Son of Man shining through his flesh and clothes. He is seen to have the Son of Man's power to draw men from the realm of the dead,[19] for two of the most notable men of the past, Moses and Elijah, come from the realm of the dead to meet him. God himself is present in the traditional cloud that veils his glory and out of the cloud issues direct endorsement of the pre-eminence of Jesus. It is essentially a temporary, preliminary manifestation of what the early preachers considered "the Kingdom of God in power": the Son of Man present in the glory of his Father, resurrecting the dead and in the supreme place under God. "And he said unto

[18] Mk. VIII:31, 34-35.

[19] Enoch LI:1-2. The Son of Man and the Elect One seem to be the same.

them, Verily I say unto you, There are some of them that stand by who shall in nowise taste of death till they see the Kingdom of God come with power. And after six days Jesus taketh with him Peter and James and John and bringeth them up into a high mountain *apart by themselves* (a special favor to "some of them that stand by"); and he was transfigured before them and his garments became glistening, exceeding white, so as no fuller on earth can whiten them. And there appeared unto them Elijah with Moses. . . . And there came a cloud overshadowing them; and there came a voice out of the cloud, This is my beloved Son, hear ye him. And suddenly looking round about, they saw no one any more, save Jesus only with themselves." [20]

A summary of the evidence then shows that the chief feature of Jesus' experience was his sense of the presence of God within him, producing his clear vision of religious and ethical values and making him feel the responsibility of unique leadership in establishing these values in the life of the nation and the world. The Jewish idea of "the Kingdom of God," a Jewish world empire, was the mould in which this unique experience was naturally cast. The idea of a cataclysmic end of the present age was a feature of this mould, and this idea Jesus accepted. He had, however, such profound present experience of these great religious and ethical realities that, as his consciousness of unique Messianic leadership developed, he finally

[20] It is often said that the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost would have been identified by the early Christians as the fulfillment of the promise in IX:1. But no situation in which the Messiah was not visibly present is likely to have seemed to the Christian Messianists who constituted the early Palestinian church as "the Kingdom of God present in power," especially in a context which speaks of the Son of Man coming in the glory of his Father with the holy angels.

felt himself to be carrying the Kingdom with him as an unostentatious present fact as well as a future cataclysmic expectation. The time of this solemn future event he did not find God revealing to him, but it seemed to him so near as to call urgently for immediate action on the part of his own generation. This view of the situation may have occasionally affected the application of his fundamental ethical principles to concrete situations, particularly in the case of the use of property. His basal religious and ethical principles, the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, are more and more clearly seen to be eternally valid, in accord with the central trend of the moral evolution of man. We constantly appeal to these great principles, perfectly expressed in his own character and life, in our effort to secure proper industrial relations, thrifty provision for the rainy day and old age, the removal of the causes of poverty and disease, the mastery of the physical world by scientific discovery and invention for the common good, the maintenance of law, order, courts, schools and all the other institutions of an honest and friendly world civilization. But such applications were not made in the teaching of Jesus. If they had been his teaching would have seemed unreal and been out of vital contact with the situation in which he lived. It is hard to see how, under such circumstances, he and his progressive movement could have gained an historical footing in the life of the race. As the will of God has unfolded a thought world has come into being in which the idea of development has to a certain extent displaced the idea of cataclysm (development may include cataclysm). Modern thinking in all its provision for the long future counts on an evolution vitalized by the will of God and not upon an end of the age near at hand. If the immortal spirit of Jesus is in constant touch with the

life of each generation, he would certainly wish to see men make new applications of his principles, however different from his own, in order to be true to the unfolding will of God in this new thought world.

CHAPTER XXIV

BEGINNING TO WALK ALONE IN THE WAY OF PAIN

WE have seen Jesus in the outland, away from the scene of his strenuous public life in Galilee, expressing conclusions that must have stirred his nature to its depths. He had been driven by inner stress of spirit to assume the Messianic rôle of the Son of Man with all its vast responsibilities. The religious experience through which he passed in reaching this conclusion we can only feebly imagine. He had also reached the conclusion that he as Son of Man, together with many of his followers, must make a great sacrifice of life in the last days before the New Age could come to birth. In all this profound experience there must have been a certain element of risk and moral adventure such as is involved in all great character making experience.[1] It is expressed in the sentence "I have a baptism to be baptized with and how am I straitened until it be accomplished!" [2] It appeared like an advancing wave that would submerge him. All the sinews of his moral nature tightened as he strained tensely forward to meet it. He tried to carry his disciples along with him but found them unready. He had to push forward, a lonely leader, into the great experience of pain brought by the rising consciousness of God within

[1] *Cf.* Heb. V:8, "learned obedience by the things which he suffered."

[2] Lk. XII:50.

him. In the oldest Gospel the unreadiness of the disciples for the profound experience of their Messianic leader appears in a section following the account of his challenge to them.[3] The challenge introducing an idea so startling threw them into confusion. Even Peter, perhaps the most discerning among them, resented it. For a week[4] there was probably much debate among them as to whether they should continue with him or abandon him. At the end of the week, when it seemed probable that most of them would go,[5] Jesus took the three most influential men for a night of prayer on the mountain, feeling sure that God would in some way hold them and through them the others. The same sort of prophetic assurance that was given him on the way to the home of Jairus (p. 135) or, according to the Gospel of John, before he reached the home of Lazarus,[6] was given to him here. What was supposed by the early Christians to have happened on the mountain has just been discussed. The modern mind, earnestly feeling after reality, cannot help wondering whether the early preachers were wholly right in their report of what happened on the mountain at this critical time. It seems easy to many to say that they were right, that two men long dead were visibly present, that a heavenly radiance did pour out from the spirit of Jesus through flesh and clothing, and that the voice of God did speak words that might have been recorded by a dictograph. Especially in these days when strange psychic phenomena are the object of serious scientific investigation it may seem to many that the literal reality of such a narrative need not be questioned. The problem for

[3] Mk. VIII:31-IX:1, IX:2-50.
[4] Mk. IX:2, Mt. XVII:1, Lk. IX:28.
[5] *Cf.* Jn. VI:66-71.
[6] XI:4-11, 41-42.

those who do question it is to discover what gave rise to the narrative in its present form, what did actually happen that the devout imagination of the early preachers could naturally reshape into this form. It was an experience in which the three disciples slept and woke, saw and heard something that suddenly vanished and left them as they were before. "Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep, but when they were fully awake, they saw his glory, and the two men that stood with him." [7] "And suddenly looking round about, they saw no one any more, save Jesus only with themselves." [8] It is possible that a vision or dream, experienced by one (presumably Peter) or more of these three men during a night of prayer with Jesus, and reported by them as something profoundly influencing the lives of all of them during this critical period, was later naturally transformed by others into a narrative of fact. The popular psychology of the period may have assumed a certain sort of objective reality back of all impressive visions and dreams. The material for such a vision or dream as this was present in their minds during this period. There had been much talk about Jesus as a possible Elijah (the vision made this identification henceforth impossible, for both were present), and about his alleged antagonism to Moses. Jesus had perhaps recently told them, not only about his temptation, but also about his closely related experience at baptism when he had heard a voice from heaven saying what is here reported. He had profoundly stirred them by talking about his death (which according to Luke, Moses and Elijah were discussing with Jesus), about the resurrection of the dead and about the Son of Man coming in the glory of his Father with the holy angels. All these

[7] Lk. IX:32.
[8] Mk. IX:8.

elements of a vision or dream were daily in their minds and their minds were tense. That God should use a vision or dream to influence the minds of men at a time when men looked to visions and dreams for guidance would not seem strange.[9]

On the way down from the mountain top (the next day, Lk.) Jesus warned the three men that they must not make this proof of his Messiahship public at present. The reasons for this have already been suggested (p. 233). It seemed to the disciples that since Jesus was now proven to be the Son of Man on earth, there was no chance for Elijah to precede him, as the scribes expected. On the basis of Malachi IV:5-6 Elijah was expected to prepare the people for the great day of the Lord by "restoring" all things to what was imagined to have been a primitive state of ideal order. This restoration would secure ideal family relationships, "turn the hearts of fathers and sons to each other," bring the young men and the old men into accord. Jesus explained to them that Elijah had come, been roughly handled, and gone. This is said to have been predicted in scriptures, though where is not evident. This seems an allusion to John the Baptist and the Matthew Gospel so explains it.[10] In connection with this explanation Jesus according to Mark discussed with them statements in the scriptures that predicted the suffering of the Son of Man.[11]

When they reached the village which they had left the day before, they found the nine disciples in the midst of a humiliating experience. A Jewish father from some neighboring village had brought to them his unfortunate

[9] *Cf.* influential visions at a critical time in the history of the early church, *e.g.*, Acts IX:10, X:1-3, 10-16, XVI:9-10, XVIII:9.
[10] Mk. IX:11-13, Mt. XVII:10-13.
[11] IX:12.

son, now almost or quite grown to young manhood, afflicted since childhood by a demon which had produced a terrible combination of ailments. He was epileptic, deaf and dumb. This had prevented any sort of intellectual development. He was violent and hard to care for. The destructive demon had often thrown the boy into the fire to burn him up or into the water to drown him. He was an only child (Lk.) and the happiness of the home had been pitifully blighted through the years by this great sorrow and constant anxiety. The father had heard of Jesus and his company as famous exorcists and had hoped to get help from them. One after another of the nine had tried their usual formula of exorcism but without producing any effect. The three leading disciples, who might have had better success, were away with Jesus and the rest had so lost confidence in Jesus during this critical week that they could not pronounce his name in the exorcistic formula with any great confidence. Scribes and others from Jewish ghettos in the vicinity who had come with the father were witnessing the failure and vigorously discussing it. Perhaps the scribes were considering the justice of the Beelzeboul theory which the Jerusalem scribes had published (p. 118). Just at this juncture they were surprised to see Jesus and the three disciples some distance away coming down a mountain path. They ran to him, greeted him, and the father at once explained the situation. Jesus broke out in an almost impatient exclamation at the lack of what he called "faith" manifest in all of them, and, for that matter in the general public as well: "O faithless generation! how long shall I be with you!" He directed the father to fetch his son who had been left behind in helplessness as the rest ran to meet Jesus. Apparently the father and son were then taken by Jesus a little way off by themselves to secure such

privacy as Jesus seemed often to seek in such cases.[12] In Jesus' presence the young man went into a violent convulsion. He fell to the ground foaming at the mouth, grinding his teeth, writhing and twisting, a shapeless thing. The distressed father explained, in reply to Jesus' sympathetic question, that this was what had been happening to him for years. He begged for help: "If you can do anything for us, take pity on us and help us!" Jesus caught up his expression: "Why do you say, 'If you can do anything?' It is not a question of my ability but of your faith. Everything is possible to one who has faith." The father in desperation cried out: "I do have faith and if it is not enough, help me to have more." Then as Jesus saw the crowd running toward them, breaking in upon their privacy, he ordered the demon to come out of his victim and stay out. The young man was left lying on the ground in a deathlike collapse but Jesus took him by the hand, lifted him up and he was found able to stand.

The incident reveals the unsatisfactory state in which a majority of the disciples were at this period and also Jesus' own wonderful conception of "faith." He and the three had come down from the mountain experience in the full exhilaration of faith, in an elevation of spirit that made all lack of faith seem a strange and heinous thing. Faith, as Jesus used the word, seems to be the reaching out of the soul of a man to work with the unseen energy of God's mighty will to bring good things to pass, such things as the removal of the terrible blight from this poor boy's life and the relief of his parents. Jesus's statement that the man who makes this connection with the will of God called "faith" can do all things[13] assumes that the mighty energy of the unfolding will of

[12] Mk. VII:33, VIII:22.
[13] Mk. IX:23.

God is always operating to enlarge life and open new opportunity to men. Jesus was constantly experiencing this through the wonderful rising of the will of God within him and the perfect adjustment of himself to it that made him the immortal, morally redeeming revelation of God in the terms, and under the limitations, of a genuine human life. Jesus' statement expresses his sublime confidence, reinforced by his experience on the mountain, that as Son of Man he could introduce an order of things in which all men should have the same experience with the will of God that he was having. A vision of humanity shaped itself in his mind in which no limit could be set to the achievements possible to a race of men working together, in the invincible good will of faith, with the unseen energy of God.

Men only dimly conscious of God's vitalizing presence and possessing only fitful and partial good will have been borne on to great achievements by the will of God, but an immeasurably greater career opens before them when faith shall become the fixed habit of humanity. In the meantime the individual man, who in his faith reaches out to work together with the unseen energy of God in good will and to the utmost, does not thereby become able instantaneously to do all that Jesus was able to do. Neither does he reproduce in its fulness the religious experience of Jesus. But he is part of a vast movement in human life, which under the leadership of Jesus, will finally issue in such a humanity as Jesus foresaw, and he himself as an immortal will have his place in the final outcome. Jesus constantly assumed immortality as an essential element in his vision of the coming Kingdom.

When the disciples privately questioned Jesus regarding the reason for their humiliating failure in the use of the formula that had usually worked so well, he recognized the

exceptional difficulty presented by such a combination of ailments as characterized this case, and said that it required prayer, presumably such special prayer as their anemic faith during this period of doubt was unequal to. Jesus' reply indicates that he as usual had prayed when this wreck of a boy was brought to him and had found instantaneous answer in the rising of the will of God within him.

The enthusiastic report made by the three leaders of their experience on the mountain seems to have revived the confidence of the rest. They probably adopted various explanations of Jesus' dark words about death, and evidently went on with their own ideas of what a Messianic career ought to be, for they will soon be found busily appropriating high offices in the prospective Kingdom.

Jesus, fully possessed by a faith that had cast his lot in with the will and way of God at any cost, had found that way to be the painful way of the cross. Nevertheless he went eagerly on in the exhilaration of faith. But he henceforth walked alone with God in the way of pain.[14] He had received strength from the experience on the mountain, for there he had seen God quicken the flagging faith of the three trusted leaders (by whatever means this result may have been accomplished). It gave him assurance that God was with him and them and would bring the Kingdom to pass.

[14] *Cf.* Jn. XVI:32, Ye "shall leave me alone, and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me."

CHAPTER XXV

SECRET JOURNEY THROUGH GALILEE: POLITICS AMONG THE TWELVE

AFTER a period of some weeks or months in the outland Jesus returned to Galilee, intending only to pass through the province on his way to some destination beyond.[1] Mark's narrative later on brings him to the "borders of Judæa and beyond the Jordan," [2] a region southeast of Galilee. In passing through Galilee his Galilean disciples would have opportunity to visit their families and attend to matters of business. Jesus himself kept his presence in the province a secret, either travelling by night or, if by day, on country paths away from cities and villages. "And they went forth from thence and passed through Galilee and he would not that any man should know it." He apparently did not wish the serious break with the hostile Galilean scribes, which had occurred before he left the province (p. 123), to develop further at present. Neither did he wish his great popularity among the people to issue in any Messianic demonstration. He felt certain that he had something to do in Jerusalem of which God willed that death should be the issue. His disciples, who had found it impossible to adjust themselves to this idea, perhaps could not be trusted to stay long in a region where an attempt to force

[1] Mk. IX:30-32.
[2] X:1.

a popular Messianic rôle upon him might again be made (p. 205). During these days he again tried to make his disciples understand that "death" and "resurrection" after a "three days" period were before him, but what these expressions could mean in the exalted career of the "Son of Man" they could not see. They were shy about asking for an explanation, perhaps because they feared that such discussion would lead him into a morbid frame of mind; [3] perhaps because they feared to arouse a certain indignation that he had sometimes expressed at their unreadiness to catch his meaning.[4]

During this secret journey they naturally visited Capernaum, the city in which some of them had homes and business.[5] One incident only in this visit is given. Its scene is in a house and not in any public place, for Jesus' presence in the city was not to be known. Its outstanding feature is the political ambition of the disciples and their consequent failure to sympathize with Jesus' expectation of suffering. During their travel on the country road, as they drew near to Capernaum where they were well known, he had walked at some distance from them, perhaps with his cloak so folded about him as to be unrecognized by any who might meet him. As he looked at them in the distance he saw from their gestures, and perhaps from the occasional sound of their voices, that a heated discussion was being carried on. Later when they were all gathered in the seclusion of the Capernaum home of some one of them (Peter? Mk. I:29), he asked what they had been discussing. No one was willing at first to reply, but it finally developed that they had been discussing who among them would be greater than the rest

[3] *Cf.* Mt. XVI:22.
[4] *E.g.*, Mk. VII:18, VIII:17-21.
[5] Mk. I:16-31.

when official positions in the Messianic Kingdom should be assigned.[6] When Jesus learned this he seated himself, according to the custom of a rabbi when giving instruction to his disciples, and proceeded to give a "lecture," or "teaching": "and he sat down and called the Twelve and says unto them." The situation and the different points of the teaching seem, as is often the case, more clearly conceived in Mark than in Matthew and Luke.

According to Mark there were two groups in the Twelve, a smaller group of leaders, each one of whom was inclined to claim the primacy for himself, and a larger group made up of those who did not expect primacy, but who planned to pay especial attention to the probable premier with a view to receiving special favor from him later, in the day of his power. They were looking forward, like all high minded Jews, to the reign of God in a righteous world; but they now conceived this future in terms of their own personal political power and honor. It would have seemed far less desirable to them, in their present frame of mind, if they had thought of it as an era of new and great opportunity for all men, with no special privileges for themselves. Devotion to the common good was not their present passion and it did not shape their ideal of the Kingdom of Heaven. They were all expecting such a Kingdom as is described in the seventeenth Psalm of Solomon, with Jerusalem as its capital, renovated, beautified, its streets delivered from the obnoxious presence of foreign officials and soldiers. From Jerusalem as a world capital Jesus, the Messiah, with a righteous nation at his disposal, would enforce the rule of God in all the world. The picture in the Psalms of Solomon has the Son of David as its central Messianic figure, but in such a picture the Son of Man, whom Jesus is now supposed

[6] Mk. IX:33-37, Mt. XVIII:1-5, Lk. IX:46-48.

to be, could easily be substituted for the Son of David, the chief difference being that the Son of Man would reign over a transformed, glorified earth.[7] All this seems fanciful to us, looking back across the Christian centuries, but to these men of Galilee it seemed literal fact; they within the next few weeks or months would find themselves constituting the cabinet of the ruler of the mightiest and holiest empire known to man. How this prospect would naturally affect the minds of plain Galilean business men and workmen can easily be imagined when we remember some modern movements that have suddenly opened the prospect of high political office to men unaccustomed to public life. If Judas Iscariot had the passion for money later attributed to him,[8] he would naturally have hoped for a chance to administer the tribute money and revenues that would pour into Jerusalem from all over the world. Such aspirations may also have stirred the mind of Matthew, the tax collector.

The smaller group made up of aspirants for the primacy, evidently contained at least Peter, James and John. Peter had been quick to recognize Jesus' Messiahship. All three had been recently taken by Jesus into the mountain for an all night conference, and on another occasion had been singled out by special attention.[9] James and John will soon appear trying to secure from Jesus a pledge of the two chief offices and exciting the indignation of the rest at this effort to outmanœuvre Peter.[10] According to the Matthew Gospel their mother, who was probably a Capernaum woman, interested herself in the matter.[11] All the relatives of all the Twelve, so far as they had been

[7] En. XLV:4-5.
[8] Jn. XII:6, XIII:29.
[9] Mk. IX:2, V:37.
[10] Mk. X:35-37, 41.
[11] Mt. XX:20.

made aware of the Messianic secret, would naturally wish to see their family fortunes advanced in the great enterprise. Peter on one occasion appears with a sense of special grievance, perhaps because of the attitude of James and John to him: "Then came Peter and said to him, Lord, how often shall my brother sin against me and I forgive him? Until seven times?" [12]

According to Mark Jesus deals first of all with this smaller group. It is to them that he says: "If any man would be first, he shall be last of all and servant of all." [13] Does this describe the punishment of the ambitious man or the way to reach the goal of his ambition? The Matthew Gospel understands it to mean the latter, for it represents Jesus as inculcating the childlike spirit.[14] If this be true it is the man ambitious simply to contribute to the general welfare and ready now for the sake of the common interest to walk at the tail end of the procession instead of at its head, who will be recognized as really great in the New Order. This also is the thought of Mk. X:42-45 where the Son of Man himself, who will be in the supreme place in the future, is said to be for the present obscuring his glory and expecting the humiliation of public execution in his devotion to the common good. It is an impressive way of saying that real personal excellence consists in the desire to contribute to the common good, not in the desire to have special privileges. The New Age will be one in which realities will be recognized. In our modern interpretation of the idea someone who works obscurely in his laboratory, running down the cause and cure of a devastating disease, moved by the divine desire to eliminate the suffering and enlarge the life

[12] Mt. XVIII:21.
[13] IX:35.
[14] XVIII:1-4.

of future generations, will be recognized in the Coming Age as really great.

When Jesus had finished his teaching to the small group, each one of whom thought himself eligible for chief honor and privilege, he gave his attention to the larger group. He called a little child of the household, whose guest he was, into the midst of the circle, took it in his arms [15] and with this action as his text said that they must not be trying to pay court to those who might be expected in the future to reward such attention. They should rather be ready to receive and entertain those (like this little child) from whom no such return could be expected. He, the supreme leader in the New Age, identified himself completely with the interests of such. If the ambitious disciples cared for his favor they must show attention to such. He had found the strong compulsion of the will of God within him thrusting him out among the unshepherded sheep, among those who had nothing to give back; he felt certain that God felt as he did about the disciples' shameful conduct: "Whosoever shall receive one of such little children in my name, receiveth me; and whosoever receiveth me receiveth him that sent me." [16]

Either on this occasion or soon after, while Jesus was concealed in the house, John reported to him an experience that a few of them had had. A benevolent man had been distressed by the fact that, since Jesus and his disciples had left Galilee, the exorcism of demons had ceased. He was one of the many who had listened eagerly to Jesus and now he had started out to see what he could him-

[15] Mt. and Lk. seem to shrink from reporting this detail; so also in their parallels to Mk. X:16; and somewhat similarly in the parallels to Mk. X:21, "Jesus looked at him and loved him!"

[16] Mk. IX:37.

self do for the wretched demoniacs, using the name of Jesus in his formula of exorcism. He had evidently been successful, at least in some cases. The demons feared the famous name of Jesus (p. 88). Such conduct had seemed to John and others of the twelve to be improper, and they had ordered him to discontinue the practice. John said to Jesus, "Teacher, we saw one casting out demons in thy name; and we forbade him because he followed not us." [17] In their view of the case the man was invading their domain, encroaching upon their prerogative. They enjoyed special distinction as a band of exorcists commissioned by the great prophet Jesus, and they did not wish to have their special distinction cheapened by common use. They enjoyed having special privileges and did not wish to see them disappear. Who could tell but that this man might become another competitive claimant for high offices in the new Kingdom! Jesus took a different view of the case. He was walking in the way of pain; he foresaw a rapidly approaching crisis when he himself would be executed and all his adherents be brought thereby into disrepute and danger. This man who was not afraid to use the Jesus formula now and be pronounced by powerful scribes an agent of Satan, this man to whom God was evidently giving power as an exorcist, would certainly be found among the faithful in time of trial so near at hand. "Forbid him not; for there is no man who shall be able to do a mighty work in my name and be able quickly (soon) to speak evil of me." In this approaching time of trial if anyone does not join the popular outcry against the enterprise of the executed Jesus, it will be only because at heart he is a friend. "He that is not against us is for us." The enterprise is God's own; whoever shall show friendliness by even so slight an act as giving a drink of water

[17] Mk. IX:38-40.

to a thirsty disciple will find God eagerly giving him reward (v. 41). God will reward and not rebuff this independent exorcist. In dark contrast with God's rewarding any friend of the enterprise, even one so humble as to have nothing but a drink of water to contribute, stands the action of him who discourages and perhaps excludes from the enterprise such humble friends. From Jesus' standpoint the rebuff given by John to this unofficial, but fearlessly friendly, exorcist seemed a heinous wrong. It might result in transforming his good will into bitterness and turning him back from the Kingdom toward which he was so truly pressing forward. A man might welcome being sunk, heavily weighted, in the depths of the sea if he was thereby prevented from doing this great wrong.

Jesus was evidently profoundly stirred by the utter failure of his leading disciples to catch the real spirit of the Coming Kingdom. After all his months of teaching regarding the broad brotherly righteousness of the Kingdom and his recent emphasis on the indispensable spirit of self-sacrifice that had already brought him in clear visualization to the shame of the cross, they see only political offices to be quarreled over! They are so blindly enamored of them that they can endanger an eager man's chance for the Kingdom without realizing what they are doing. In his indignation Jesus says that if they continue in this spirit, they will find themselves in hell instead of holding high offices in the Kingdom! In bloody figures of speech he warns them to make any painful sacrifice of ambition rather than fail to have the humble devotion to the common good requisite for entrance into the Kingdom. They should not hesitate to chop off hand or foot, or to tear an eye from its socket, if these members would keep them out of the Kingdom. A one-eyed, one-handed man, a man limping about in the glory of the

Kingdom would be infinitely better off than an able bodied man in Gehenna fire, where refuse is always burning and maggots always stirring in decaying carcasses. "If thine eye cause thee to stumble cast it out; it is good for thee to enter into the Kingdom of God with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell; where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." [18] This language, already stereotyped in Jewish religious literature before Jesus' day,[19] described a situation which now seemed to the disciples very near at hand. They could almost feel the hot breath of Gehenna fire.

Jesus then proceeded to apply his warning more pointedly to the case of the Twelve. The text, as we have it, contains a play on the word fire. There is Gehenna fire and also another fire, the fire of such painful self-sacrifice as has just been described. The fiery pains of self-sacrifice are like the salt that preserves from the decay otherwise to be experienced in Gehenna. They are saved from fire by fire. "Everyone shall be salted with fire." If the spirit of self-sacrifice, that serves like salt to preserve from moral decay, be lost, there will be nothing to take its place. It is like salt that has lost its saltness.[20] They must have this saltlike spirit of self-sacrifice in themselves and be kept by it from any further disgraceful quarreling over high offices in the Kingdom. "Salt is good; but if the salt have lost its saltness, where-

[18] IX:47-48.

[19] Gehenna: Gai Hinnom, valley or gorge of Hinnom "lamentation," a place near Jerusalem, Josh. XV:8, where Ahaz sacrificed to heathen gods, II Chron. XXVIII:3, and which was therefore afterward defiled as a place of abominations and the scene of Jehovah's judgment. *Cf.* Jer. VII:31, 33. In Jesus' day it was a common name of the place to which the wicked dead were consigned.

[20] Coarse salt, perhaps distilled from Dead Sea water, would be full of impurities. A mass of these impurities would remain and popularly be called "salt," after the real salt had disappeared.

with will ye season it? Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace with one another." [21]

The Matthew Gospel contains a peculiar paragraph relating an incident that apparently belongs to this period.[22] While Jesus was concealed in the house in Capernaum one of the temple tax collectors met Peter on the street and asked him whether Jesus paid the temple poll tax.[23] Peter was sure that he did. When Peter returned to the house Jesus, seeming to know what had happened, at once asked whether kings collect taxes from their own sons. When Peter replied that they do not, Jesus seemed to draw the conclusion that neither would God want the temple tax to be collected from Jesus and his disciples who are thought of as true sons of God, true sons of the Kingdom. But, Jesus said, it was better to pay the tax rather than have trouble over the matter, and told Peter that he would find money enough to pay the tax for both of them in the mouth of the first fish that he should catch. What Peter understood this language to mean does not appear, for nothing further is said. Why should the Jewish Christians living in the original environment of this Gospel have been interested in this subject? Perhaps among them there was a difference of opinion about the propriety of continuing to pay the temple tax while they were being more or less persecuted by the temple authorities. There may have been some effort made to continue the collection of this tax after the destruction of the temple in the year 70. The temple authorities of course did not consider this destruction to be final. They expected the building to be rebuilt as it had been after previous disasters; and they would naturally have been

[21] IX:50.
[22] XVII:24-27.
[23] Ex. XXX:13.

collecting funds for this purpose. It would have been necessary, on account of Roman watchfulness, to do this more or less secretly and as an appeal to voluntary patriotism rather than as the enforcement of a right. It is just this sort of appeal that appears when Peter is asked whether his teacher is not among those who pay the tax. The compiler of the Gospel, while recognizing the force of arguments against paying the tax, feels that it would nevertheless better be paid. The tax commandment is one of the "least commandments" that cannot be neglected without running the risk of being "called least in the Kingdom of Heaven." [24]

[24] Mt. V:19.

CHAPTER XXVI

IN THE BORDERLAND OF JUDÆA AND PERÆA; JESUS RESUMES PUBLIC TEACHING

JESUS in the outland had almost entirely discontinued public teaching, and in recently passing through Galilee he had travelled incognito. But now in a region nearer Jerusalem, where the Peræan [1] territory bordered on Judæa, he began again to speak to the people. "And he arose from thence, and cometh into the borders of Judæa and beyond the Jordan; and multitudes came together unto him again, and, as he was wont, he taught them again." [2]

It had been a break with the Pharisean scribes, from all over the country,[3] that ended Jesus' work in Galilee (p. 123), and now it was a collision with them that marked the resumption of public teaching in this new region.[4] They had tried to enlist the Herod party against him in Galilee. Here in Peræa he was again in Herod's territory,[5] and they at once tried to secure from him a public utterance that would enrage Herod and his wife. John the Baptist had publicly criticized Herod for marrying his sister-in-law, and the unscrupulous woman had given

[1] Peræa, "the Beyond," beyond Jordan.
[2] Mk. X:1.
[3] Lk. V:17, Mk. III:22, VII:1.
[4] Some manuscripts omit the word Pharisees.
[5] Mk. III:6, Jos. *Ant.* XVII:8:1.

herself no rest until she secured John's execution.[6] Herod had divorced a wife to marry his sister-in-law and she had put away her husband in order to marry Herod. Jewish law did not give the woman the right to divorce her husband, but Roman law did.[7] Mark, the Roman Gospel, seems to have this in mind when it represents Jesus as saying that if a woman "herself shall put away a husband, and marry another she committeth adultery."[8] The Pharisees did not dare definitely to bring up the case of Herod, for the more conservative of them doubtless disapproved his conduct and all of them his wife's conduct. They were eager, however, without compromising themselves to lead Jesus into a public utterance that would get him into trouble with the court party. They seem to have felt sure, when they brought the question up, that he would strongly oppose divorce.[9] The position that Jesus took in his reply to the Pharisees, though Herod's name was not mentioned, would naturally have irritated both Herod and his wife; it would have strengthened Herod's theory that the spirit of John the Baptist had entered the body of Jesus and was still to be reckoned with.[10] He did not, however, proceed against Jesus during these few weeks that Jesus spent in his Peræan territory. He was probably shrewd enough to see that the scribes would in some way secure Jesus' execution; they, and not he, would then experience the unpopularity occasioned by the execution of so popular a prophet.

There was another phase of the divorce question which the scribes meant to make embarrassing to Jesus. The

[6] Mk. VI:14-29. Other influences were also at work, Jos. XVIII:5:2.

[7] Jos. *Ant.* XV:7:10.

[8] X:12. Some mss. and versions read "leave her husband."

[9] *Cf.* Mt. V:32.

[10] Mk. VI:14.

scribes held that Jesus was a wicked, dangerous man because he took advantage of his great popularity to teach disregard of the law of Moses. Jesus had denied that he was against the law; he was only against the scribes' interpretation of the law, which interpretation he in turn said was vitally antagonistic to the law it purported authoritatively to explain (p. 122). They expected now to draw from Jesus some utterance on the divorce question that would prove him to be in disagreement with Moses. One of the laws of Moses permitted a man formally to divorce his wife, but required him to provide her with a document declaring her divorced.[11] This divorce law did not state the grounds on which the husband might send her out of his house, and this uncertainty gave occasion for various opinions among the scribes. Some recognized a wide range of grounds for divorce; others a very limited range. This law of Moses was favorable to the woman, for it forbade a husband to order his wife arbitrarily, by a single word of command, out of his house, a proceeding that was practically certain in many cases to drive her into a life of shame. She must receive from him a divorce document which would be positive proof to everyone that she was not a temporarily discarded wife, but a genuinely divorced woman and therefore eligible for another marriage. If the divorce document sometimes contained a statement of her husband's reasons for divorcing her (as it generally did not),[12] these might appear to be so unimportant as not to lessen her chance of marrying again. Even under such protection many divorced women were probably driven into professional or semi-professional immorality. Jesus' evident compassion for such pitiable cases may have been one influence leading

[11] Deut. XXIV:1.

[12] Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, p. 70.

him to take strong ground against the easy divorce that broke up homes on slight provocation and tended to result in widespread social evil.

He admitted that he was opposed to this divorce law of Moses, but he did not regard this as bringing him into collision with Moses, for he argued that Moses himself did not really approve of this law. The low moral standards of the time, their "hardness of heart," had made it impossible to enforce a higher law and had driven Moses, against his desire, to publish this unsatisfactory enactment. Moses' real ideal was expressed in his account of the creation where he reported a commandment of God which Jesus, laying emphasis on the expression "one flesh," interpreted as really forbidding all divorce. "But Jesus said unto them, For your hardness of heart he wrote you this commandment. But from the beginning of the creation, 'male and female made he them. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they two shall become one flesh'; so that they are no more two but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." [13] In Mark's Gospel no mention is made of adultery as constituting ground for divorce.[14] This may be because Jesus felt that a penitent adulterer or adulteress should be forgiven and taken back by the offended party just as any other sort of penitent sinner would be. Or it may be that Mark assumed as a matter of course that Jesus regarded adultery as a proper ground of divorce. The Matthew Gospel specifies this sin as a justification for divorce.[15]

When the scribes thrust the divorce question upon Jesus,

[13] Mk. X:5-9.
[14] So also Lk. XVI:18.
[15] Mt. V:32, XIX:9.

they seemed to be performing a master stroke of policy. They hoped to embarrass him not only by bringing him into collision with Herod's practice and with Moses' law, but by making him criticize the status of many families throughout the country. Among his popular following there must have been many who adopted the view of divorce taught by the less strict scribes. Jesus' statement represented such divorced persons as had remarried to be living in open adultery, and their children to be illegitimate. The scribes naturally assumed that Jesus' attack upon these homes would greatly lessen his influence. According to a passage peculiar to the Matthew Gospel [16] even Jesus' disciples resented his strictness. They said that a man would better not marry if there was no chance for divorce: "The disciples say unto him, If the case ("cause" of divorce?) of the man is so with his wife, it is not expedient to marry." Jesus replied that not all men could safely refrain from marriage. He proceeded to mention three classes of men physically incapacitated for marriage and added a statement, ambiguous as it stands, which seems to mean that others who could safely refrain from marriage might do so. This is the position taken by Paul in view of the short time to elapse before the end of the age.[17] Jesus evidently regarded the stability and moral vigor of the home as an essential factor in a civilization preparing for the Kingdom of God. It must not be the unstable institution that easy divorce seemed to be making it. In the New Age there would be no such institution as marriage and consequently no divorce question.[18]

Children are naturally thought of in connection with

[16] Mt. XIX:10-12.
[17] I Cor. VII.
[18] Mk. XII:25, Mt. XXII:30, Lk. XX:35-36.

the home, and Mark at once adds a paragraph revealing Jesus' feeling about children.[19] Among the crowds that flocked around him again after his period of retirement were many mothers who had brought their children ("babes," Lk.) to be touched by one whom they reverenced as a famous prophet. The popular idea regarding the value of the touch has appeared before in Mark's Gospel.[20] The fact that Jesus' touch had cured so many sick, perhaps made these mothers feel that it would keep their children healthy. The Twelve felt that the reputation of Jesus among the men was likely to suffer from the conspicuous public handling of babies and talking with their mothers.[21] It seemed utterly out of place for one who was about to assume the administration of a great world empire to be so engrossed in such interests. In the great political events soon to occur nothing of political significance could be expected from mothers and babies. No one of the Twelve who had recently been quarreling over political prospects would have tried to show his fitness for high office by such conduct! They tried, therefore, to stop the eager approach of the mothers. When Jesus saw what they were doing the indignation, which they had learned to fear,[22] began to rise in him. He told them that it would be necessary for them to have the spirit of these little children if they hoped to enter the Kingdom. The Kingdom belonged to such. Children had the simple, spontaneous, uncalculating spirit of the Kingdom. To Jesus the essence of life in the Kingdom was simple daily

[19] Mk. X:13-16.

[20] III:10, V:28, VI:56.

[21] *Cf.* Jn. IV:27; at the well in Samaria "his disciples marveled that he was talking with a woman." Even the Matthew and Luke Gospels seem to shrink from reproducing Mark's statement that he took the children in his arms.

[22] Mk. IX:32.

good will expressing itself in all the elemental relations of ordinary life.

The disciples received a shock when they discovered how highly Jesus esteemed commonplace little children as he saw them in the brightness of the coming Kingdom. They soon received a much greater shock when they found that a wealthy citizen, apparently of irreproachable life and high standing in the community, was not an acceptable candidate for the Kingdom and that Jesus regarded all rich people as being, because of their riches, most unlikely to enter the Kingdom.

The incident is reported with considerable detail.[23] As they were starting out from their lodgings a well-dressed young man, an official ("a ruler," Lk.), came running up to them, with great deference kneeled before Jesus and asked him to specify some action that would carry with it sufficient credit in righteousness to make his account in God's great ledger surely show a balance in his favor in the day when books should be opened and men be let into the eternal life of the coming Kingdom.[24] He regarded Jesus as a great prophet preaching everywhere the nearness of the Kingdom and competent to give an expert's opinion on this subject. Jesus at first seemed to doubt the sincerity of this extraordinary deference exhibited by one of a class with which he was not popular. He treated the man with reserve. He criticized his use of the adjective "good," or "beneficent," in addressing him.[25] That

[23] Mk. X:17-31, Mt. XIX:16-30, Lk. XVIII: 18-30.

[24] The Matthew Gospel compiled among Jewish Christians who were familiar with rabbinic modes of thought puts the question in this form: "What good thing shall I do to inherit eternal life?"

[25] *Cf.* Rom. V:7. "Hardly for a righteous man will any one die; possibly for his benefactor ("the good man") some one even dares to die." The word is said not to be used in the Talmud in addressing rabbis.

word ought to be reserved for God, the ultimate source of all benefactions to men.[26] He then reminded him that he himself knew well enough what were the commandments that lead into the everlasting life and proceeded to refresh his memory by enumerating a list of the ones that concern human relations. He assumed that a Jewish gentleman would not be an idolater, a Sabbath breaker, or a profane man. The list varies in the different Gospels. Mark paraphrases the commandment against coveting in a way likely to probe more deeply after a rich man's probable sin: "Do not defraud." The Matthew Gospel adds, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," a commandment which the compiler regards not as displacing, but as carrying with it obligation to keep all the commandments of the law (p. 328). The man was not repelled by Jesus' reserve; he very simply said that he had been religiously trained and had always kept these commandments. Then, according to Mark, Jesus looked at him for a moment, recognized his sincerity and felt his heart go strongly out toward him; "Jesus looked at him and loved him." He even proceeded without further acquaintance to offer him a place among the inner circle of his disciples. The young man was a gentleman, perhaps also a scholar, and possessed a personality that in important particulars would have made him a great apostle. The only condition was that he should do what the others had done, give up all property and business and join them in preparing other men for the coming Kingdom.

[26] The Matthew Gospel is unwilling to represent Jesus as talking in this way. Such language would have been seized upon by its hostile Jewish environment and used to the disadvantage of the Christian message. Therefore the form of the young man's question is first changed and Jesus' reply then made to read: "Why askest thou me concerning the good." But this change does not fit the following context, "one is the good."

Jesus' requirement further specified that he should give the proceeds of the sale of his estate to the poor. That is, he must let the needs of others appeal to him as powerfully as his own. He must surrender special privileges and try to share them with others. In the eternal life of the coming Kingdom men in reciprocal friendship would bear each other's burdens. If this man wished to be ready for such life he must begin to live it now. But these few moments were for him a preliminary Judgment Day. He saw that he did not care to inherit such eternal life. He cared more for his money, for the social standing, power and gratification of luxurious tastes that his money brought him, than he did for men. He went away, slowly, reluctantly and very sad. It is often said that Jesus merely wished to test the man and that if he had found him perfectly ready to give up his property he would have had him keep it. But Jesus did not deal with the Twelve in this way (vs. 28-29), and there is no reason to suppose that he would have done so with this young man.

As the young man walked away Jesus took occasion to say that the rich would find it very difficult to enter the Kingdom of God. This statement amazed his disciples.[27] It seemed to them that respectable rich people might be the first of all to enter. Their surprise shows that Jesus had not previously been preaching the renunciation of property as essential to readiness for the Kingdom to any others than the Twelve. Jesus repeated his statement in a stronger form. Using the camel as the proverbial symbol of bigness ("strain out a gnat and swallow a camel"),

[27] Some texts read "those that trust in riches." But there would have been nothing in such a statement to amaze the disciples. It was a very commonplace, unquestioned idea that those who trusted in riches had no standing with God.

he said it would be easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of God.[28] This seemed to the disciples an utterly unpractical view. Jesus was setting up impossible standards. They said with some impatience, "Who then can be saved?" ("Saved," that is, have eternal life in the Coming Kingdom.) Jesus qualified his statement to the extent of admitting that God could perform the miracle.

What is there about the possession of property that made it seem to Jesus so difficult for the rich to live the life of the Kingdom of God? The man or woman with plenty of money has opportunity and strong temptation to gratify, and so to strengthen, a wide range of refined or unrefined selfish desires. What he wants he can take. This unfits him for the unselfish life of the Kingdom. Friendship is the great fact in the life of the Kingdom. But it is very difficult for a rich man to have, or to be, a true friend. Under ordinary circumstances he has no keen sense of needing other men. It gratifies his pride to have about him many ostensible admirers and many subordinates ready to do what he wants done; but he has little sense of that real dependence which gives rise to the genuine gratitude that is an essential element of genuine friendship. He cannot help having a strong sense of power to inflict social or financial "punishment" on those who oppose him. The temptation to use this power in unwarrantable ways is not easily resisted and yielding is ruinous to character. It is difficult for him to be a real friend to the multitudes of ordinary people, because his habits of life and scale of expenditures are so different

[28] It is sometimes said that there was a little gate near a big city gate called "The Needle's Eye" through which a camel might squeeze. There seems to be no adequate evidence for such a statement. And furthermore Jesus' point is that the thing he speaks of is actually "impossible with men" (v. 27).

from theirs that he cannot meet them on the level where there is normal reciprocal give and take intercourse. He hands "help" down to them with more or less conscious or unconscious patronizing. Furthermore, sincerity is the soul of friendship and, therefore, of the life of the Kingdom, as Jesus conceived it. But the rich man's social relationships are apt to be artificial and insincere. Hardly anyone tells him with wholesome frequency just what he thinks of him! Poor people practically feel a sense of disadvantage in his presence which makes them dislike to be with him, although they attempt to conceal the fact; or else they are always secretly wondering what they can get out of him for themselves or for some cause that they represent. They do not sincerely want *him* nor he *them*. When the rich associate with the rich there is apt to be a process of more or less subtle comparison and competition going on which is ruinous to the simple, sincere friendships that Jesus supremely valued. In addition to all this, the accumulation and care of riches take so much of a man's time that he has little leisure for the development of friendship. Friendship takes time. All this and more Jesus must have seen as he studied life, and consequently he dreaded riches both for himself and his disciples. At the same time it is to be recognized that the atmosphere of the Gospels is charged with expectation of the speedy end of the age. There was no thought of the modern situation in which vast industrial, political, philanthropic and educational enterprises would be developed more and more insistently calling for, and securing, democratic, friendly co-operation of rich and poor, enterprises in which wealth, skill, learning, the collective intelligence and faithfulness of masses of men face each other with little uncomfortable sense of superiority or inferiority at any point.

Jesus' repulse of so fine a man perhaps threatened a renewal of the dissatisfaction which had been recently occasioned among the Twelve by Jesus' repellent prediction of suffering. If so, Peter relieved the situation by calling attention to the fact that they had done what Jesus required of the rich man, abandoned homes and business: "Peter began to say unto him: 'Lo, we have left all, and followed thee.'" Jesus spoke with appreciation of this sacrifice and assured them that it would be rewarded in the remaining portion of the present age by their getting a hundred times as much property and as many relatives as they had given up, and in addition the blessed eternal life of the Coming Age. This seems to be a characteristically picturesque statement of the fact that the friendships and spiritual possessions of the present time of sacrifice and persecution were incomparably more valuable than all that had been sacrificed. Jesus, as often, may be here speaking out of his own experience. He had been constantly finding among the people those who in penitence and devotion set their faces toward the New Order, ready to do the will of God. He had already expressed his appreciation of them when he said: "Whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother and sister and mother." [29] He had found spiritual values consisting in friendship and work together with God and man for high ends, far better than anything that he had sacrificed by leaving his Nazareth home and business.

The Matthew Gospel draws a picture of reward in the Coming Age which represents the sort of Kingdom anticipated by the Jewish Christians among whom this Gospel was compiled.[30] It predicts the long expected national "rebirth," or "regeneration," when the twelve tribes will

[29] Mk. III:35.
[30] Mt. XIX:28-30.

be gathered in from all over the earth and each apostle be the head of a tribe. Luke, as well as the compiler of the Matthew Gospel, found some such picture in Q, although Luke (whether with greater or less faithfulness to Q is uncertain) omits the reference to the national "regeneration" and pictures the twelve apostles as regularly having special places at Jesus' own table in the great banquets of the Kingdom.[31]

The Matthew Gospel adds a parable illustrating the fact that there will be many, like the respectable rich man, who seem to have the first and best chance to enter the Kingdom, who will nevertheless enter, if at all, at the very last. "But many shall be last that are first; and first that are last."[32] The parable is a story out of the life of those with whom Jesus had so much to do, workmen in need of the day's wage in order to live. The owner of a vineyard sympathized with the unemployed so deeply that he went himself, instead of sending a steward, to the various markets where the unemployed gathered. He kept going all through the day even to the eleventh hour, just before sunset. When his steward paid them off at night he directed him to pay them according to their need and not according to their earning. Those hired at the eleventh hour were to be paid off first and to receive a full day's wage. From the standpoint of the Matthew Gospel the meaning is clear enough. It was the "unshepherded sheep," the common folk, the penitent publicans and sinners, whom Jesus was gathering in at the end of the age, who would come up first for entrance into the Kingdom, rather than the scribes, the rulers and the rich who were so sure that they had earned special privilege. The point comes out more explicitly a little

[31] XXII:28-30.
[32] Mt. XIX:30-XX:16.

later when "Jesus said unto them (the chief priests and elders of the people), Verily I say unto you that the publicans and the harlots go into the Kingdom of God before you." [33] —

[33] Mt. XXI:31.

CHAPTER XXVII

IN THE BORDERLAND OF JUDÆA AND PERÆA (*Concluded*); STARTING FOR JERUSALEM

JERUSALEM had been the center of danger for months. Great scribes from the city had come into Galilee, denouncing Jesus as an ally of Satan and prepared to assist in his arrest and execution. As soon as he should now pass out of Peræa into Judæa he would be within the jurisdiction of the Great Court, the Jerusalem Sanhedrin, in which leading scribes had an influence rivaled only by that of its priestly members. According to the Gospel of John Jesus had made visits to Jerusalem of which there is no record in the first three Gospels, and had been in danger of losing life there.[1] Nevertheless Jesus now pressed on toward the point of danger, often walking alone ahead of his disciples in tense determination to reach the city. His conduct amazed many of his followers. Those who, like the Twelve, followed steadily did so with foreboding: "And they were on the way, going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was going before them; and they were amazed; and they that followed were afraid." [2]

For the third time Mark records an almost stereotyped condensation of Jesus' teaching to the inner circle re-

[1] Jn. VII:1, 10-14, VIII:59, XI:53-57.
[2] Mk. X:32.

garding "death," "resurrection" and a "three days" period, this time adding a reference to the official scourging that would precede execution and to the rough burlesque of royalty that Jesus was to suffer at the hands of brutal soldiers in the Roman barracks.[3] The disciples' attitude toward whatever Jesus said to them on this subject probably remained what it had been in earlier discussions (p. 238).

In the face of Jesus' solemn expectation of suffering the political ambition of two prospective leaders flames out.[4] They are so preoccupied with the idea of personal honors in the Kingdom, to their minds so near at hand, that they cannot seriously consider any other aspects of the situation. The Matthew Gospel puts part of the blame for this obtuseness on the mother; Luke omits the shameful scene entirely. The two brothers, James and John, ask Jesus to make a definite pledge to them of the two highest offices in the new state. Why did these offices seem desirable? What functions did they picture themselves performing? Did they see themselves in public processions at the temple, and making long journeys to distant parts of the world attended by such retainers as they were accustomed to see in royal processions on the world highways that ran through Palestine? Was it a peasant's dream of irresponsible power, more possible under the oriental conditions of that day than in modern times when the personal responsibility of rulers is greater and rulers can in various ways be called to account by public sentiment for abuse of power? In his reply Jesus reminded them of the suffering through which he and his must pass before the period of power should come. They evidently had no clear idea of what Jesus meant by any of

[3] Mk. X:32-34, Mt. XX:17-19, Lk. XVIII:31-34.
[4] Mk. X:35-45, Mt. XX:20-28.

his references to prospective suffering, but they eagerly assured him that they were ready for anything. Jesus then told them that he had no authority to fill the offices they wished to hold. These offices would be held by those whom God should select: "to sit on my right hand or on my left hand is not mine to give; but it is for them for whom it has been prepared (by my Father, Mt.)." The Gospel narrative imparts a tinge of sadness to the words of Jesus. These two men were said by Jesus to be asking for more than they realized. They were, indeed, to drink the same cup that he drank. It seems to be implied that a martyr's death awaited both. By the time that Mark's Gospel was compiled at least one of the two had been executed.[5]

When the ten learned what had happened they were very indignant at the unfair attempt made by the two brothers. Jesus called them together and spoke to them in a way which suggests what had really been in the minds of the two men. They had wished to be able to give orders with oriental arbitrariness and see them instantly carried out. Jesus tried to shame them by an appeal to national pride, describing their conduct as "Gentile" conduct. The officials of Gentiles "lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them." [6] The spirit that Jesus desired to see has been already considered. He emphasizes the fact here that he was himself not dreaming of arbitrary power. He was expecting "to give his life as a ransom for many." In his vision of the future he saw "many," throngs of people, "ransomed," that is, set at liberty from some form of bondage. Bondage to what? Apparently to that against which all Jesus' teaching is a protest, the selfish, evil

[5] Acts XII:1-2.
[6] Mk. X:42.

will to power, whether demonic, as the early Christians thought, or purely human. He saw a race of men freed from the handicap of selfishness and all its disastrous train of consequences. It was the sacrifice of the life of the Son of Man on the threshold of the New Age that would introduce the Age of good will, the Age of the brotherly sons of God. How did Jesus think that the sacrifice of his life would serve to produce this result? He gives no reply at this point. The question is bequeathed to Christian experience and thought. How has the death of Jesus served to break the dominance of the evil will to selfish power in the life of man? Or how is it tending more and more to do so? How are men actually being made better by the death of Jesus? This question will appear again as Jesus comes closer to the place where he "gives his life."

Jesus and his company constituted one of many groups in the long procession of Passover pilgrims crossing the Jordan at the Jericho Fords, and singing psalms as they made their way among the palm groves and gardens of the tropical Jericho plain. Two notable incidents occurred in the city of Jericho where Jesus and his disciples spent the last night before they reached Jerusalem. In one of them Jesus had a characteristic experience with a rich tax collector[7] and in the other with a blind beggar.[8] The tax collector was one of the head collectors of the district, evidently a business man of executive ability and probably none too scrupulous, for he had piled up a very large fortune. He had been hearing that Jesus, the famous prophet of Galilee, was in the neighbourhood of the city.[9] He knew that Jesus was

[7] Lk. XIX:1-10.
[8] Mk. X:46-52, Mt. XX:29-34, Lk. XVIII:35-43.
[9] Mk. X:1.

famous as the strange prophet who preached the nearness of the Kingdom of God and yet, on the very eve of the Judgment Day, did not hesitate to associate with irreligious men like himself. Jesus and his large company of Galilean pilgrims entered the city late in the afternoon and the city turned out to see him. The collector, who was a short man, climbed a tree at a point where he saw that Jesus would pass, in order to see him well. When Jesus reached the place, he noticed the man in the tree and saw something in his face that instantly arrested his attention. He found out who he was and asked him to give him lodging for the night. Many in the crowd showed that they were shocked at this. It was bad enough to enter such a man's house and eat his "unclean" food at any time, but specially reprehensible at a time when all the devout were preparing to observe the holy festival.[10] The collector, deeply moved by the friendliness of Jesus and fearful that he might after all lose his guest, resolved at any cost to keep him. He knew the two things that Jesus chiefly stood for as the prophet of righteousness: friendliness and honesty. He promised, therefore, on the spot to give half of his entire estate to the poor and to pay back fourfold every dishonest overcharge that he had ever made. This probably used up most of his property. Jesus saw in him a man now all ready for the honest and friendly life of the Kingdom, and declared that "salvation," that is, life in the Kingdom of God, had that day come to him and his household; he was a true son of Abraham, the father of the true Israel to which the Kingdom belonged. He had been "lost," lost out of the family of God, out of the relationship which the honest and friendly man sustains to the people among whom he lives, but now he had found

[10] *Cf.* Jn. XI:55.

his place again. Luke seems to himself to have pictured Jesus in the very act of saving a lost man and adds the comment, "For the Son of Man came to seek"—as he had sought entrance into this man's house—"and to save that which was lost." What took place in the collector's house as Jesus met his family and talked with him in the seclusion of the housetop through the evening under the stars we should be glad to know. Jesus must always have been an entertaining guest, with his keen sense of humor, genial friendliness and clear insight into the everlasting realities of life. It would be still more interesting to know what thoughts were in the reformed publican's mind a few days later when he heard of Jesus' execution and the events that succeeded it.

The other incident occurred as Jesus was leaving Jericho the next day for the final stage of his journey to Jerusalem. A blind beggar sitting by the roadside learned from those around him who was going by, and instantly, without trying first to be brought to Jesus, began to shout at the top of his voice. The startling thing was that he called Jesus by a Messianic title: "When he heard the crowd passing by he inquired what this was. They explained to him that Jesus the Nazarene was going by; and he shouted, saying, Jesus, Son of David, pity me." The people about him tried to quiet him, but he only shouted the more. Jesus stopped, had him brought to him, found out what he wanted and told him that his faith had cured him. At this word of assurance the nerves of sight began to function. With the intense joy of a man whose world of darkness and beggary had been turned into a world of light and work, he joined the crowd going up the long fifteen miles of steep ascent to Jerusalem.

The fact that he applied a Messianic title to Jesus shows that, although Jesus had concealed his Messianic conscious-

ness, there was more or less of popular talk about the possibility of his turning out to be the Messiah. When the air was charged with the idea of the nearness of the Kingdom, it was inevitable that such rumours should gather about so great a prophet as Jesus. It evidently seemed to Mark most significant that as they drew near to the capital city, the Messianic cry should be raised by a representative of those for whom Jesus had been so deeply concerned, the sick and the poor.

Luke inserts at this point a parable very like one that appears in another context in the Matthew Gospel.[11] Luke, unlike the Matthew compiler, seizes upon a single minor point in the parable as suitable to this context although the main drift of the story has nothing to do with this point. According to Luke the Twelve believed that the Kingdom of God would begin during the next few days in Jerusalem. The Passover festival which brought together multitudes of Jews from all over the world seemed to them the natural time for Jesus to make his Messianic consciousness public and to await the endorsement of God. He "spake a parable because he was nigh to Jerusalem and because they supposed that the Kingdom of God was immediately to appear." It was the story of a nobleman who went into a far country to receive for himself a Kingdom—like some of the Herods going to Rome—and to return, the implication from Luke's standpoint being that Jesus had yet to go into a far country in order to receive his Kingdom and that it was his "return" for which men ought to be looking. Then follows the main body of the parable, which like the Matthew rendering of it, tells how the nobleman's servants used the money he left with them for investment during his absence (p. 345). Another peculiar feature is added

[11] Lk. XIX:11-27, Mt. XXV:14-30.

by Luke, namely, that the nobleman's subjects (distinguished from his servants), sent a protest to the authority from whom he expected to receive his Kingdom (again like the experience of one of the Herods), and that consequently when he returned, successful in his quest, he had them slaughtered before his eyes.

Sometime late in the day, after hours of hard climbing,[12] the group of people traveling with Jesus reached the city. Just before they entered something happened that later seemed of great significance as the early Christians looked back upon it.[13] They recognized the fact, so evident in their day, that Jesus was now virtually presenting himself in the capital of the nation as a Messianic leader for acceptance or rejection by the national leaders. It was entirely natural that this should have been less evident at the time than later. The language used by the people on this occasion, as reported by the oldest Gospel, does not explicitly call Jesus the Messiah; it is ambiguous, as applicable to a great prophet of the coming Kingdom as to the Messiah. The later Gospels, Matthew and Luke, transform Mark's language into a definite ascription of Messiahship to Jesus.[14]

Mark reports that when Jesus and his company drew near to Bethany and Bethphage, eastern suburbs of Jerusalem, Jesus sent two of the disciples to a hamlet, telling them to bring a colt of an ass which they would find tied there. If any one should object they were to say that

[12] The difference of level between Jerusalem and the Jericho plain is about three quarters of a mile, although the places are only fifteen miles apart.

[13] Mk. XI:1-10, Mt. XXI:1-9, Lk. XIX:28-38.

[14] Mk. XI:9-10, "Hosanna! Blessed (be) he that comes in the name of the Lord. Blessed (be) the coming Kingdom of our father David!" Mt. XXI:9, "Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed (be) he that comes in the name of the Lord. Lk. XIX:38, "Blessed (be) the King that cometh in the name of the Lord."

their lord had need of it. It was assumed that the objectors would know, at least after a word of explanation, who they were and that Jesus, now famous the country over, was their "lord," or teacher. It is uncertain whether Mark means this to indicate supernatural knowledge on the part of Jesus or some private arrangement that he had previously made with friends. In any case it represents the arrangement to have been definitely planned by Jesus. The animal would be one that had never been used, which to the Jewish mind would indicate that it was now to be used for some holy purpose.[15] When the animal was brought Jesus mounted it. Some in the crowd picked twigs from trees and strewed them in his path; many took off their cloaks and spread them on the ground before him. Some in the crowd certainly did this as an expression in pantomime of the hope that he would turn out to be the Messiah. Restoration of sight had made the blind beggar doubly sure that Jesus would be the Messiah and he no doubt had been expressing his conviction with enthusiasm all day. Jesus must have realized that there was this feeling in the crowd, and he deliberately, though not in words, encouraged it. He had often found the suggestive parable a congenial way of expressing his thought. This was a situation in which his Messianic consciousness expressed itself in a kind of acted parable. As in the case of most of his spoken parables, there was no definite challenge to direct opposition. Roman spies in the crowd would have found nothing alarming to report. A few scores, possibly several hundreds of poor people, were amusing themselves on the journey by a harmless piece of pantomime in which (according to Mark) they simply expressed the hope that the Kingdom, which everyone knew the prophet to have

[15] Num. XIX:2, Deut. XXI:3.

been preaching for months, might indeed be near. Nothing took place which the Jewish authorities were able to use as evidence against Jesus when a few days later he was on trial for his life. Even according to the Matthew Gospel, which gives a more definitely Messianic coloring to the occasion, as soon as the crowd entered the city and were called upon to explain their unusual enthusiasm, they simply reported that they were with Jesus, the Galilean prophet. "And when he was come into Jerusalem all the city was stirred, saying 'Who is this?' And the multitudes said, 'This is the prophet Jesus, from Nazareth of Galilee.'" [16]

And yet this scene gave expression to the deepest emotions in the heart of Jesus. He had now fully accepted a mission in some sense Messianic. He was coming to his capital city. He was coming not on a war horse with armed men about him, but on the animal used in times of peace. Perhaps the Zechariah passage cited in the Matthew Gospel may have been in Jesus' own mind:

> "Tell ye the daughter of Zion,
> Behold, thy King cometh unto thee,
> Meek, and riding upon an ass,
> And upon a colt the foal of an ass." [17]

He was a poor man's Messiah, riding on a borrowed animal, with poor people all about him. He came to his capital with only an inner equipment: his sense of the presence of God; his ideals of life and the certainty that it was under his leadership that God meant these ideals to be realized; and his readiness to suffer death for the accomplishment of this result.

[16] Mt. XXI:10-11.

[17] Zech. IX:9. The Matthew Gospel understands the language of the prophecy to describe two animals.

The special source used by Luke pictures Pharisees in the crowd objecting to the conduct of the enthusiasts and pictures Jesus lamenting the doom of the city that lay sullenly waiting for him, all unconscious of the true significance of his arrival:

"And as he was now drawing nigh, even at the descent of the mount of Olives, the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty works which they had seen; saying, Blessed is the King that cometh in the name of the Lord; peace in heaven and glory in the highest. And some of the Pharisees from the multitude said unto him, Master, rebuke thy disciples. And he answered and said, I tell you that, if these shall hold their peace, the stones will cry out. And when he drew nigh, he saw the city and wept over it, saying, If thou hadst known in this day, even thou, the things which belong unto peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee when thine enemies shall cast up a bank about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall dash thee to the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation." [18]

[18] Lk. XIX:37-44.

CHAPTER XXVIII

WHAT DID MESSIAHSHIP MEAN TO JESUS?

JESUS developed a religious experience which, more surely than ever after nineteen centuries, is seen to be vitally related to the higher life of man. According to the sources one feature of the experience in its later period was consciousness of what the Jews called "Messiahship." This consciousness was a part of the personal character of Jesus. Messiahship was not an office, which he held as a man might hold a presidential office, but a personal responsibility involving certain vital relations with God and men that constitute character. Since his Messianic consciousness was an essential feature of his character, it must have been, like all character, to some extent at least, a growth. In the preceding chapters an effort has here and there been made to discern in the Gospels the stages of this development. Naturally these stages are only very dimly traceable. Those who compiled the Gospels were not concerned to do anything so academic and theological as consciously to trace such development. The Gospels were compiled to meet what their compilers recognized to be the immediate vital needs of their own generation and possibly of the generation immediately to follow. They were interested in Jesus as a matured Messiah, after he had "learned obedience through the things which he suffered" and had become: "a source of eternal salvation to all them that obey him." [1] They called

[1] Heb. V:8-9.

him "The Messiah," "The Christ," "The Son of God," "The Son of Man," "The Lord," leaving each free to supply whatever context he might naturally put into any one of these titles. These, and other related titles, are to us mere names, each one varying in meaning at different periods in the history of its use. The question of vital interest to us is this: When Jesus near the end of his life came up to the capital city, what was the nature of the feeling that he best described to himself as the conviction of "Messiahship"? The answer is reasonably clear. In general it was the conviction that God had laid upon him the personal responsibility of unique leadership in establishing true religion in the world, leadership in bringing God's ideal of righteousness to secure realization in the lives of all men. All men were necessarily in a Jewish Messiah's vision. If there was to be a Messiah at all, in the Kingdom of God, he would necessarily operate on a world scale. The Kingdom of God, in all forms of the idea, whether more or less provincial, was the dominion of God through the Jew over all the world.

Is there in the Gospels any evidence regarding the nature of Jesus' connection with God that finally resulted in fastening the conviction of Messianic leadership upon his mind? The conviction was evidently an outgrowth of his experience in feeling and doing the will of God, of his experience in obediently exploring the will of God. To Jesus the will of God was a mighty force close at hand and vitalizing all things. It was clothing the flowers with beauty, providing the birds with food, dropping the rain and keeping the sun shining on the fields of righteous and unrighteous farmers, feeling a warm fatherly sympathy with all the common needs and cares of men, women

and children, always silently speaking into them thoughts that, if received, would enlarge their lives.[2]

As we have seen, Jesus felt this mighty loving energy rising within himself and overflowing in the forgiveness of sins and the healing of disease. Between this loving will and himself there were the steady interplay of feeling and interchange of thought that constitute true prayer. As it rose within him it kindled his great passion for a righteous world in which honesty and friendliness should characterize all men in all their relations to God and their fellowmen. Out of such experience with the will of God was born the conviction that God expected of him unique leadership in the sphere of feeling and doing the will of God. The "wise and knowing" religious leaders of his nation were accustomed to call untrained men, like himself and his disciples, "babes" who needed scribal feeding and training.[3] But his experience of the will of God made him sure that he was far above them. This assurance did not beget pride in him, but only gratitude and "meekness." An utterance in a period of exultant prayer, when "he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit," was deeply impressed upon the minds of his disciples: "I thank thee, Father, Lord of the heaven and the earth, that thou hast concealed these things from 'wise and knowing' men, and hast revealed them to 'babes.' Yea, Father, (I thank thee) that it was well pleasing in thy sight (so to do). To me all things have been delivered by my Father and no one knows well the Son (knows who the son is, Lk.) except the Father; neither does anyone know well the Father (who the Father is, Lk.) except the Son, and he to whom the Son wills to reveal him."[4] The form of

[2] Mt. V:43-48, VI:25-30, IV:4.
[3] *Cf.* Rom. II:17-20.
[4] Mt. XI:25-27, Lk. X:21.

this utterance, especially in Luke, may slightly reflect the theological interests of the Gospel compilers, but in any case the consciousness of a uniquely intimate acquaintance with God stands textually secure. This is the consciousness that is expressed by the words whatever be the nature of the "sonship"—ethical, official or metaphysical. That is, Jesus had mysterious dimensions, or reaches, of personality that gave him capacity for unique leadership in feeling the will of God in its bigness and intensity, and in making that inner adjustment to the will of God that constitutes character. Combined with this was the feeling that he must exercise the leadership for which his experience with God had fitted him. He could not do otherwise without failing in moral character, for the essential nature of the will of God was its urge to share. No man in true obedient contact with it could have any good thing for himself alone. When Jesus found himself experiencing in unique degree the intimate and obedient contact with the will of God, described in the passage just quoted, it was inevitable that he should feel himself thrust out into the position of leadership described in the sentence that follows it: "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke (of the law) upon you and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart and ye shall find rest unto your souls," [5] the "rest" that consists in the reproduction of Jesus' contented adjustment to the vast will of God.

It was this inner sense of being thrust forward by the will of God into the responsibilities of supreme religious leadership which he was qualified by personal experience to exercise, that drove Jesus to assume the Messianic title. In the Jewish thought world there was no other name for the function that he felt himself under moral obligation

[5] Mt. XI:28-29.

to perform. Prophets urged on by God could warn and threaten, invite and promise with a certain sense of divine authority back of them, but the mere prophet could not feel what the Messiah felt, namely, capacity and consequent responsibility for, and the mighty urge of God toward, the exercise of supreme leadership in the higher life of man.

Jesus' consciousness of Messianic leadership involved profound interest in all men and sublime confidence in their capacity to follow their leader in feeling and doing the will of God. His own inner urge from the will of God to lead, meant an inner urge from the will of God in them to follow. What we call the "love of God" was urging him out toward them through the kindling of his own soul, and was drawing them to him through the kindling of penitence and devotion in them. He felt that they were capable of following in whatever path he was capable of leading. He confidently assumed that he could lead them into his own prayer experience. He encouraged them to pray in groups of two or three, being sure that he himself would be praying in spirit with them, and would be sharing with them his own victorious sense of God's answer (a saying that was afterward used by the Christian preachers as a promise of the spiritual presence of their risen Lord in heaven with his praying disciples on earth[6].) He believed that he could lead them into his own experience of power through faith in God, into the honor of suffering with him in order to bring in the Kingdom of God. They could be as closely related to him as a brother or sister or mother, if they would join him in doing the will of God: "For whosoever shall do the will of God, this one is my brother and my sister and my

[6] Mt. XVIII:19-20.

mother." [7] These implications, like most others in the first three Gospels, come to more explicit expression in the Fourth Gospel. There he definitely proposes to share his mission, his power to forgive sins, the increased power to do mighty works which will be his when he is once again with God in the unseen world, and in general his entire relation to God: "Go to my brothers and say to them, I ascend to my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God." [8]

The various phases of this great experience with the will of God, group themselves under three ideas that run through all his teaching, namely, the Fatherhood of God, a phrase that connotes superior power and loving care over beings like in kind to himself and indebted to him for existence; the brotherhood of man, or the unity of the human race; and personal immortality, or the durability of the righteous individual in a brotherhood unimpaired by the phenomenon of physical death. Jesus was not the original discoverer of these ideas, for they all appear either before his day or among contemporaries uninfluenced by his thought. They are ideas that more and more evidently seem to represent the central trend of the moral evolution of man, which is the unfolding will of God. But Jesus in his exploration of the will of God conceived them with the peculiar simplicity and warmth of intense personal experience, and with a sense of their unity or inseparableness. They appear in simple form unencumbered by the mass of non-essential and unworthy matter sometimes associated with them elsewhere. They have the penetrating warmth of intense personal experience and not the chill abstraction generally characteristic of their

[7] Mk. III:35.
[8] Jn. XX:17, 21, 23, XIV:12-14.

presentation in more philosophical connections. And they are a unity. Religion and ethics, the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, are presented as inseparable; and personal immortality is assumed, in the idea of the Kingdom, as essential to the proper development of both sonship and brotherhood.

Since Jesus in his obedient exploration of the will of God adjusted himself perfectly to what he discovered ("becoming obedient even unto death"),[9] he became the revelation of the character of God. As the thought is expressed in the Gospel of John, because of perfect submission to the will of God, he became the perfect expression of the character of God. Because of this he could express consciousness of authority as the representative of God—"all things have been delivered unto me by my Father"—in almost the same sentence in which he spoke of himself as "meek and lowly in heart."[10] It was a consciousness that was at the same time uplifting and subduing.

The sort of authority exercised by Jesus in view of his Messianic consciousness was peculiarly favorable to the development of character in others. Authority that is based on the leader's experience and that summons others to try for a similar experience, is an authority that stimulates character. It is not the sheer, arbitrary authority that insists on unquestioning obedience, which is always unfavorable to the growth of character. It is rather the sort of authority that necessitates the initiative requisite in the nature of the case for character.

From this view of the matter it is easy to see why Jesus only gradually reached the conclusion that his mission was "Messianic." It took time for him to explore the will of God and find himself necessitated by his discoveries to be

[9] Phil. II:8.
[10] Mt. XI:27, 29.

the Messiah. It is also easy to see why he should have been solicitous about concealing his Messianic consciousness when it did form within him. He needed first to put before the nation the great ideals of righteousness that he found in his exploration of the will of God. The Messianic idea was historically so knit up with political and nationalistic aspirations that its religious aspects suffered. Even his most intelligent disciples, as we have seen, were so intoxicated by ambitious dreams of future political greatness that for a while they nearly lost their moral balance. Nevertheless there seems to have been no way for Jesus' inner consciousness of world leadership to find historical footing and to become real, either in his own mind or in the minds of his countrymen, except in the form of a "Messianic" consciousness.

We may recognize the provincial and temporary character of Messianism, but the religious experience of Jesus, to which the idea was a temporary necessity, remains an everlasting and increasingly redemptive fact. Jesus is today the supreme leader and redeemer of men in the sphere of their higher life because he had the supreme religious experience. He redeems men from the power of the evil will by leading them into such a share of his own experience as they are able with the help of his immortal Spirit to achieve.

CHAPTER XXIX

JESUS IN COLLISION WITH THE PRIESTS; PRIESTS AND SCRIBES COMBINE

JESUS came to Jerusalem knowing well what to expect from the great Jerusalem scribes. He had already faced some of them in Galilee where they had declared him an ally of Satan, sent to seduce God's people from allegiance to the law (p. 118). He in turn had felt it necessary to criticize them severely in his public teaching,[1] a proceeding that tended to destroy their professional reputation and undermine their influence with the people. The personal element had entered into the situation, as is often the case in theological or scientific controversy, and had made the scribes doubly bitter against him.

Jesus, however, proceeded at once in Jerusalem to antagonize another powerful class whose representatives have not previously appeared in the Gospel narrative, the priests of Jehovah's temple. The head priests were leading Sadducees and most of the scribes were Pharisees, so that in now antagonizing the priests Jesus massed against himself the whole force of a well organized ecclesiastical and theological "machine." He had behind him, however, a large unorganized popular following. Although he had never countenanced the radical revolutionary movement of Judas and Saddouk (p. 35), he

[1] Mk. VII:6-13.

was the hero of the people, especially in Galilee. Many citizens of Jerusalem may have been under the influence of the "machine." Their immediate financial prosperity would have depended upon the favor of the powerful priests of the temple and the great scribes of the numerous synagogues in the city. The temple must have brought an unusual amount of business to the city because it attracted thousands of pilgrims and required large numbers of animals and other offerings for sacrifice. But many of the best citizens of Jerusalem would have been repelled by close contact with the hard professionalism of the learned scribes, with the arrogant greed of the head priests and their subservience to the Romans who kept them in office. Citizens in Washington, outside of office holders, office seekers and profiteers, are not always the most enthusiastic admirers of the personnel of the administration.

Just now the city was filling up with thousands of Passover pilgrims from various parts of the world. Those who came from distant regions would know little or nothing about Jesus except what they heard after reaching the city. Those who came from northern Syria, from the ghettos of the great cities east of the Jordan [2] and perhaps even from the Alexandrian ghetto, would have heard rumors of his power as an exorcist, healer and unorthodox religious teacher.

When Jesus and his friendly company of Passover pilgrims entered the city they went immediately through another gate into the sacred quarter which contained the House of Jehovah and the extensive paved open courts that surrounded it.[3] In these open courts and spacious

[2] Mk. III:8.

[3] This walled quarter in the southeastern part of the city was perhaps a third of a mile long from north to south and a sixth of a mile wide.

porticoes they mingled with hundreds of Jews and proselytes from all over the world. Many of these pilgrims perhaps fell on their faces and thanked God that they were able once more to look across the terraced courts at the beautiful House of Jehovah, gleaming in white and gold, which none but superior priests might approach. Since it was late in the day Jesus and the Twelve soon went out to Bethany, an eastern suburb where earlier in the day or weeks before, they had arranged with friends for lodgings during the Passover festival.[4] Probably only the wealthier pilgrims were able to pay the high prices charged for quarters inside the city. Many of the poor may have camped in the open country.

As he had walked about in the temple courts Jesus had seen things going on that aroused his indignation. The scene in certain courts was that of an oriental market rather than a place of worship. Dealers in poultry and live stock were there with their crates of doves for the poor man's offerings and their droves of sheep and oxen. They could probably guarantee that the priests would accept their birds and animals as unblemished victims suitable for sacrifice. Close by were money changers, ready to change foreign coin into local currency. As Jesus watched their operations he saw that the pilgrims were being unmercifully cheated. High prices and extortionate rates of exchange were being charged. This resulted in angry protests from many of the pilgrims. On every side were the excited voices of violent altercation. Here were people who had with painful economy saved money enough to make the expensive journey by sea or land to Jerusalem in order to pray and sacrifice

[4] Mk. XI:19, "And whenever evening came, he went forth out of the city."

before Jehovah's House. But who could pray in the midst of such confusion and with such bitter sense of being cheated in the very presence of Jehovah and by those whom the priests of Jehovah (perhaps with profit to themselves) had established there!

During the night in Bethany Jesus resolved to put a stop to such proceedings. From a certain point of view there was every reason why Jesus should have acquiesced, at least for the present, in this situation which had become more or less traditional. He had enough powerful enemies already without adding a new set to their number. Tactful conduct might win for him a largely increased following among the Passover pilgrims, many of whom were well-to-do and did not mind paying a little extra for offerings and exchange at such a time. The old temptation to temporary compromise may have recurred (p. 79). However, early the next morning Jesus was at the temple. He went at once to the merchants and in vigorous language told them to leave. He knocked over the seats which the poultry sellers were occupying and the tables of the money changers, sending their carefully piled coins rolling everywhere on the pavement. According to the Fourth Gospel [5] he made himself a whip with which he personally drove the live stock out of the place.

Mark represents him as doing one other thing calculated to produce a quiet devotional atmosphere in the place. People had been accustomed to use the temple quarter as a short cut between the city and the eastern suburbs.

[5] Jn. II:15, placed at the beginning of Jesus' public life in accordance with the general viewpoint of the Fourth Gospel. Luke omits everything except the general statement that "Jesus expelled the merchants." Perhaps he feared that the action would seem undignified to his readers on the part of one whom he loved to describe as the gracious Lord.

Jesus stationed some of his men at various entrances to the temple quarter with instructions to turn back any person who should appear carrying any article, and so evidently on some errand of business not connected with worship. "He would not permit anyone to carry a vessel through the temple." [6] It may seem strange that Jesus should have been able so to usurp the place of the Chief of the Temple Police, "the Captain of the Temple," and secure obedience on the part of merchants and suburban citizens, but he was evidently possessed of great personal force, was known to have a large popular following in the city, and was correcting practises which many recognized as abuses. As the people heard what was happening hundreds must have quickly gathered. Jesus fearlessly proceeded to make an address to them in which he vigorously denounced the priests for their mal-administration of the temple. He asserted that the place designated by God in the scripture as one where all nations were to gather for prayer, they had turned into a robber's cave! They had made it a place where bad men collected plunder from travelers. "He taught and said unto them: Is it not written, My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations? But ye have made it a den of robbers." [7]

Jesus' action and public speech in the temple courts must have stirred the whole city. The scribes and head priests in alarm at once met together for consultation. All traditional differences of viewpoint were forgotten in their desire to defend themselves against this common enemy. They feared that he was planning a revolution. It might be the beginning of a period of disorder for which the Roman authorities would hold them responsible and

[6] Mk. XI:16, "Vessels" translated "goods" in III:27.
[7] Mk. XI:17, *cf.* Is. LVI:7, Jer. VII:11.

which would result in loss of office for the High Priest and his friends and loss of influence for the leading scribes. They began to plan for his arrest and execution as the scribes had earlier done in Galilee.[8] His great popularity made it necessary to proceed with utmost caution: "And the chief priests and the scribes heard it and sought how they might destroy him; for they feared him, for all the multitude was astonished at his teaching." [9]

The priests and scribes did nothing that day except appoint a committee to call Jesus to account. He appeared the next day walking about in the temple courts,[10] perhaps looking to see whether his orders of the previous day were being observed. Naturally a large company would at once be attracted to him, and, according to the Matthew Gospel, he was "teaching." Suddenly he was confronted by this committee composed of priests, scribes and a few other distinguished members of the Great Court.[11] They at once asked him from whom he had received authority to do what he had done the day before. The question was doubtless recognized as a subtle implication that he had received his authority from the one whom the scribes had all along accused him of serving, namely, Satan (p. 118). In his action of the preceding day Satan had invaded the temple of God! Jesus was not overawed by these great officials. Neither great audiences nor individual great men disturbed his self-possession. He said that he would answer their question if they would tell him one thing, namely, from whom John the Baptist had received authority to call the nation to a repentance baptism. This was an embarrassing ques-

[8] Mk. III:6.
[9] Mk. XI:18.
[10] Mk. XI:27.
[11] Mk. XI:27, *cf.* XIV:53, XV:1.

tion because all the people held that John was a prophet sent from God, and if the committee should formally deny this they would be more unpopular than Jesus had already made them. More people than ever would then side with Jesus who was known to have been the friend and enthusiastic admirer of John.[12] They had probably agreed with the opinion that John as well as Jesus had connection with Satan,[13] but they did not dare to whisper such a suspicion now. On the other hand, if they should say that God sent John, they would confess themselves antagonistic to God, since they had kept aloof from John's movement. They, therefore, weakly replied that they did not know! This was a humiliating confession of incompetence as true leaders and guides of the people. In their own hearts they knew that they did not dare to say what they thought, which was still more humiliating, and that they did not dare to force an answer from Jesus. The question which Jesus asked them was not merely a shrewd attempt to embarrass them. He was really asking them the question that was being informally put to everyone by the logic of daily events, namely, what they thought of himself, for John's movement and his own had been closely and sympathetically related.

Although Jesus refused to answer their question directly he did proceed to give a veiled answer in the form of parables one of which Mark reports.[14] In language sometimes used in the Old Testament to describe Jehovah's relation to the Jewish people,[15] he told of a land owner who spent a great deal of money on his vineyard. He set out the vines, built a stone wall around it, equipped it with

[12] Mt. XI:11.

[13] Mt. XI:18, "John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say He hath a demon."

[14] Mk. XII:1-12, Mt. XXI:38-46, Lk. XX:9-19.

[15] *E.g.*, Is. V.

its own wine press and vat, built a watchman's tower for its protection from thieves, then let it out to renters and left the country. When in due season he repeatedly sent agents to collect the rent, the tenants refused to pay and abused the agents, even killing some of them. The owner, who was a strangely patient man, finally sent his son, sure that the renters would respect him and pay the rent. But the renters saw their chance to get permanent possession of the vineyard for themselves by killing the heir. Accordingly they killed him and threw the corpse over the wall into the road denying him a decent burial. (Mt. and Lk. say they took him outside to kill him, which probably seemed to the early Christians suggestive of Jesus' suffering "without the gate").[16] Jesus said that the owner under such aggravating circumstances would come and kill the renters and give the vineyard to others. Then Jesus turned directly on the delegation and asked them with some sarcasm whether in their exhaustive professional study of the scriptures they had never read of the incompetent builders who failed to recognize the great stone sent up from the quarry by the architect to serve as corner stone in the structure: "Have ye not read even this scripture: 'A stone which the builders rejected, this became a head of a corner. This was from the Lord and is wonderful in our eyes!'"[17] This parable, or rather allegory, in a veiled way, only suspiciously suggestive at the time but perfectly clear to the early Christians later, told who Jesus was, the Messianic Son of God, predicted his murder and the destruction of his murderers. The allegory was particularly pertinent when it made the point that the renters wanted the vineyard for themselves. The priests did not wish

[16] Heb. XIII:12.
[17] Ps. CXVIII:22.

for a Messiah. They preferred to have the situation remain as it was. The high positions and the large temple revenues which were now theirs might be lost to them if a Messiah should come. Many of the scribes were also well satisfied with the social prestige which they were enjoying and did not care to risk losing it through the coming of a Messiah with a new order. They were ready to keep the inheritance for themselves, even though they might have to kill the Son in order to do it.

Mark represents the vineyard to be given to "others," which to his Gentile readers means Gentiles. The Matthew Gospel, in accordance with its general viewpoint, carefully notes that the others to whom the Kingdom of God will be given are *"a nation"* bringing forth its fruits, that is, a reformed Jewish nation, freed from the burden of its present wicked leaders, a nation to which of course peoples from all over the world may be annexed provided they keep the commandments of Moses as it represents Jesus to have taught them to do.[18] Luke adds a comment, either his own or attributed to Jesus, regarding the danger of maltreating the "corner stone." He who falls on it will himself be broken; he on whom it falls will be scattered as dust.[19]

The Matthew Gospel adds two other parables. In one [20] a father sent his two sons to work in his vineyard. One refused to go but afterward went; the other said he would go, but did not. Jesus, referring to his question about John the Baptist, said that the penitent publicans and harlots, at first flagrantly disobedient but later penitently obedient, were like the first son; the scribes and priests were like the second, making large professions of obedi-

[18] Mt. XXI:43, XXVIII:20, V:17-19.
[19] Lk. XX:18, *cf.* Is. VIII:14-15.
[20] Mt. XXI:28-32.

ence, but failing to obey when they had the chance to ally themselves with God's great prophet John, and still at the present moment continuing obdurate after having seen the striking reformations in character produced by his preaching. "For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not; but the publicans and the harlots believed him; and ye, when ye saw it, did not even repent yourselves afterward, that ye might believe him."

The other Matthew parable is that of the doomed city that insulted its king at the time of his son's wedding.[21] Twice after the wedding feast was all ready he sent his messengers to gather in the invited guests, but the summons was absolutely ignored. The business of the city went on as usual, and some of the messengers were insolently abused and killed. The king burned up the city, and destroyed its inhabitants. Then he sent his messengers out to gather in guests both good and bad from far and wide. When the king entered the banquet hall to inspect his guests he found a man unsuitably dressed. He order him to be tied fast hand and foot, to be carried out from the blazing light of the royal hall and left in the outer darkness where invisible beings would be heard wailing and grinding their teeth. The noise indicated that there were many such, who had been invited but not accepted as guests. The city of Jerusalem had a definite individuality distinguishing it from the country in general. Although the House of Jehovah was there and priests and great scribes filled its streets, it had a reputation for perversity in its relation to Jehovah himself. Its evil disposition toward Jesus, the Messiah in disguise, had been especially evident. Scribes from Jerusalem had attacked him in Galilee. It was a prophet

[21] Mt. XXII:1-14.

killing, messenger murdering city: "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killeth the prophets and stoneth them that are sent unto her." [22] It had, according to Jesus' semi-sarcasm, a monoply of prophet killing. "It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem." [23] He had come to the city anticipating rejection and death at its hands. God had twice summoned it (as indicated in the parable) to prepare for the inauguration of the Kingdom and the Messianic Son of God, first in the preaching of John the Baptist, and then in the proclamation of Jesus and the Twelve. Instead of heeding the summons it had gone about its regular business, even turning the temple courts into a market place! It had set itself with murderous intent against both John and Jesus, facts that Jesus was at the moment emphasizing in his interview with the leaders of the city. There could be but one outcome of such conduct. The city would be destroyed. Then God would gather in the people from far and wide, shepherdless sheep, publicans, harlots and those from other nations as well (provided they respected Moses' law),[24] for other nations were always included in the Messianic picture of the best Judaism.

Then follows a paragraph probably due to the shaping influence of the early preachers in the Jewish Christian circles in which the Matthew Gospel was produced. It is a hostile reference to the radical Gentile Christianity that seemed to conservative Jewish Christians to be flouting the Mosaic law. (Paul himself had occasion to protest against such, Rom. VI: 15.) This element has repeatedly appeared in the Matthew Gospel: those Christian preachers who break and teach others to break com-

[22] Mt. XXIII:37.
[23] Lk. XIII:33.
[24] Mt. XXVIII:20, *cf.* V:17-19.

mandments of the law;[25] the prophets, successful exorcists and miracle workers all operating in Jesus' name, but who do "lawlessness";[26] sons of the evil one in the Kingdom, close up against the righteous, causing "stumbling" among the righteous by doing "lawlessness";[27] the "bad" gathered in with the good at the Messianic banquet, in the present parable (v. 10). Such persons are represented here by the man who appeared at the Messianic banquet without suitable dress. He had been wordy enough in his blatant controversial days, but finally he was reduced to speechlessness (v. 12). Perhaps there were some among the extremely conservative Jewish Christians who, when they read this paragraph, thought they could identify the man alluded to![28]

The committee of the Great Court realized that they were being attacked by Jesus in these pungent parables in the presence of the great crowd that eagerly pressed about them to listen. They could not give him an adequate answer in words and they did not dare just then to give him an answer in terms of brute force. They, therefore, withdrew to their headquarters, suspecting more than ever that Jesus had been tempted by his popularity to undertake immediately a Messianic policy and that his bold assumption of authority in the temple the day before had been the first step in it. "They were seeking to seize him—and feared the people—for they knew that he had spoken the parable with reference to them. And they left him and went away."[29]

[25] V:19.
[26] VII:21-23.
[27] XIII:30, 41.
[28] *Cf.* Acts XXI:20-22.
[29] Mk. XII:12.

CHAPTER XXX

CONTINUED CONFLICT WITH THE JERUSALEM PRIESTS AND SCRIBES

BEFORE tracing the further development of Jesus' relations with his powerful enemies during the last week of his life, attention should be given to an incident revealing the sense of vast inner resources with which he faced the deepening blackness.[1] It is not so much the incident as the words of Jesus connected with the incident that are impressive. According to Mark and Matthew, Jesus, on his way to the city early in the morning, after the night in which he decided to expel the merchants from the temple, was hungry. He say a fig tree in the distance, noticeable because it had leaves which are usually preceded by fruit,[2] although the regular fig season had not arrived. When he reached the tree and found nothing but leaves he expressed the wish that no one might ever find fruit on it. According to the Matthew Gospel the foliage instantly shriveled up. According to Mark the tree was found withered the next day as Jesus and his disciples passed along. Luke omits the strange incident entirely. However, he, and he only, records a parable in which a man, who was disappointed by finding a fig tree fruitless for three successive years, proposed to cut it down, but was persuaded by his hired man to let him cultivate it with particular care for a

[1] Mk. XI:12-14, 20-25, Mt. XXI:18-22.
[2] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, XVI:26.

fourth year, and then to cut it down if it should be still fruitless.[3] It is possible, as is often said, that this parable grew into an historical incident in the course of the preaching of the pre-Gospel period.

The Mark Gospel uses the incident as the text for a wonderful utterance of Jesus. It represents Jesus to have regarded the withering of the tree as an act of God, performed in response to what Peter called Jesus' "curse," and to have told his disciples that if they would have a similar faith in God, even greater results would follow their praying. They would not only be able to wither a tree, but to make the hill on which the tree was growing fly through the air into the distant sea. "Jesus says to them, Have faith in God. Verily I say unto you, Whoever shall say to this mountain, Be lifted up and thrown into the sea, and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that what he is saying is happening, it shall be to him (as he says). For this reason I say unto you All things whatsoever ye pray and ask for, believe that ye received them and they shall be yours." As has been suggested earlier, this statement lets us to some extent into the inner prayer life of Jesus (p. 85). The utterance, since it is in accord with what Jesus had said before and had often assumed, may be considered entirely apart from the incident to which Mark has attached it. It is most impressive when heard from his lips during these last days of his life. He was almost in the grip of powerful merciless enemies, some of them conscientious, which increased the danger. He expected shame and death. Yet he firmly believed that God would express himself in some mighty word or act that should transform the evil earth into a part of the Kingdom of the Heavens. This he felt would be done by God through the shame and death of himself

[3] Lk. XIII:6-9.

as Messianic leader and through the followers with whom he would share his shame and power. They too, as well as he, were to "have faith in God." Faith in God, as has been said before, is the reaching out of man to work with the unseen energy of God at any cost for the creation of an honest, and friendly world. Jesus appears here with sublime confidence in God's power and purpose to produce an astounding result through himself and his true followers in the life of faith. The will of God in mighty volume surging up within Jesus enabled him to overtop the black evil that rose in his pathway. His consciousness of direct touch with the power of God made the very hills seem to stir from their bases as he walked back and forth between the city and his lodgings, the black day drawing ever nearer. He seems to have had an almost ecstatic sense of the power of God to produce physical and moral results. The mighty power of God that has pushed the Christian enterprise forward in all its changing forms through the centuries was here pushing up in the heart of the Leader. What kind of Messianic leadership Jesus expected to exercise after his death, in what form he forecast the triumph that he felt sure would follow his death, we may not know. But he felt the great fact of the powerful presence of God so directly and distinctly that nothing, however difficult, seemed impossible. The morally purifying power of such direct contact with the powerful will of God is evident in Jesus' statement that he who feels it must have only goodwill in his heart. It is only the human heart of simple good will that can have uplifting contact with the vast good will of God: "Whenever ye stand praying forgive if ye have aught against any." [4]

The next step in the shrewd, hard scheming of priests

[4] Mk. XI:25.

and scribes was to attract to their coalition the so-called Herod party. An effort had been made to enlist this party against Jesus earlier in Galilee (p. 114) and recently in Peræa in connection with the discussion of the divorce question. The Herods were closely connected with Rome from which they derived their political support and the priests and scribes were now hoping through them to arouse the sinister suspicion of the Roman authorities against Jesus. If he should turn out to have Messianic ambition smouldering in his heart, it would be well to have the Roman authorities suspicious of him at the earliest possible moment. They sent to him, therefore, a delegation made up of Pharisees, presumably scribes, and in addition certain members of the Herod party.[5] It was their purpose to lead him in an unwary moment to make a statement that could be used to his extreme disadvantage. To throw him off his guard a group of younger men, "disciples of the Pharisees" (Mt.), came to him apparently proposing to become his disciples. They began with unctuous flattery, complimenting him upon the boldness with which he had faced the imposing committee from the Great Court. They said it was evident that he did not regard the social or political standing of men but taught sincerely the "way of God." They assumed that in response to such an approach, leading very possibly to a large and influential addition to his following, he would be glad to discuss freely and confidentially any question of conscience concerning which they wished advice. "They say to him Teacher, we know that you are truthful and do not care for anyone; for you do not look at the person of men but teach in truth the way of God. Is it lawful to pay the poll tax to the Emperor? Shall we pay it or not?" Of course, if Jesus should advise them

[5] Mk. XII:13-17, Mt. XXII:15-22, Lk. XX:20-26.

not to pay the tax he would stand out as a confessed revolutionist, a dangerous character who could be immediately reported to the Roman officials by the Herodian members of the delegation. Or, perhaps, as a Galilean, he would be handed over to Herod Antipas for punishment.[6] If, on the other hand, he without qualification advised the submissive payment of the tax, this unpatriotic advice would be published broadcast and he would lose the respect of a considerable number of his popular following. Judas, the Galilean, had carried on a vigorous propaganda along this line. All those who had any sort of lurking sympathy with these views would, to say the least, lose much of their interest in Jesus if it could be reported that in the capital city in conference with Herodians he had definitely declared himself on the Roman side at this point. His popular following would in this way be sufficiently weakened to make it safe for the priests and scribes to proceed against him, without fear of consequences to themselves.

Jesus evaded the difficulty with shrewd honesty. He called for a silver coin that had on it the Cæsar's picture and name. He asked whose picture and name were there and when he was told said: "Give back Cæsar's things to Cæsar and God's things to God." It is ordinarily said that in the first half of this statement Jesus argued from the unprotested circulation of this coin among the people their acceptance of Cæsar's rule and, therefore, the logical necessity of paying the Cæsar's tax. This may be true, but it does not sufficiently explain his emphatic reference to the picture on the coin. There was always an undercurrent of resentment among the people against any picture of man, beast or bird. It seemed to them contrary to the commandment in the decalogue against making any

[6] *Cf.* Lk. XXIII:5-7.

"graven image or likeness." [7] One very saintly rabbi is reported never in all his life to have looked on a coin that had such a picture on it. At his burial his friends covered certain statues nearby so that "as in life he looked at no pictures neither should he see any in death." [8] Sometimes special coins without any such likeness were minted for the Jews in Palestine. So when Jesus called for a coin and pointed to Cæsar's likeness upon it, it was with a tinge of humor that he virtually said: "Send Cæsar's picture back to Cæsar! Pay the tax and get the offensive coin out of the country!" Then he added with great seriousness: "Give back to God what belongs to God." That is, "Yield to God penitent obedience." This reply virtually advised patience. It meant, "Pay the tax for a while and in the meantime by penitence be preparing the way for God to bring in the Kingdom." Jesus in this way took ground that was probably approved by the common sense of a majority of truly religious people throughout the nation. They felt that if the nation would only render to God penitent obedience, God would soon send his Messiah and give the nation world supremacy in the Kingdom of God. What God wanted was a nation of penitents and not a nation of revolutionists. In this way Jesus took sides neither with the extreme revolutionists nor with the servile priests. If he had expressed this view in the course of a long discussion of the subject, he would probably at some point necessarily have laid himself open to harmful misquotation by both sides. Instead he made this terse, picturesque reply, which was absolutely to the point, which it was impossible to forget

[7] Ex. XX:4.

[8] Bacher, *Die Agada der palestinensischen Amoräer*, III, p. 616. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism*, pp. 62-65; Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes*, II, p. 90.

or garble, and which because of its wit could be given swift currency among the crowds to the increase of his popularity. It is not strange that the members of the delegation "were not able to take hold of the saying before the people" and that they "marveled at his reply and held their peace." [9]

Jesus was next visited by a delegation of Sadducees, the party to which the principal priests belonged. They attempted publicly to discredit him as a teacher by showing the absurdity of belief in a life after death which he, as well as the Pharisees, was known to hold. These Sadducees argued that the law of Moses assumed the termination of existence at the time of death, for otherwise most scandalous complications would result. To show this they presented what was probably a hackneyed case.[10] The law of Moses [11] required a man to marry the childless widow of his brother and regard the first son of this marriage as the child of his deceased brother. In the famous hypothetical case, solemnly cited by the Sadducean delegation, seven brothers in turn were, in accordance with this law, called upon to marry the same woman. Finally, after the death of the seventh brother, the woman also died. Now in case there really was to be life after death horrible scandal would result, for in heaven there would be a polyandrous woman with seven husbands! The spokesman of the delegation asked, with a half concealed smile, which one of the seven might claim her as his wife! Jesus quietly assured them that their sad blunder in reasoning was due to their surprising ignorance, first, of the scriptures, and, second, of the power of God. God had power to create and maintain a civilization in which the

[9] Lk. XX:26.
[10] Mk. XII:18-27, Mt. XXII:23-33, Lk. XX:27-40.
[11] Deut. XXV:5-6.

physical relationship of marriage would not be needed for the perpetuation of life. "For when they shall rise from the dead they neither marry nor are given in marriage but are as angels in heaven" (in whose existence it is assumed the Sadducees ought to believe, though they do not).[12] Also in their lamentable ignorance of the scriptures they had failed to notice the "bush passage,"[13] which reported God, when speaking to Moses out of the burning bush, as still calling himself the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob some centuries after they had died. It was a cheap, unworthy conception of God to regard him, in Sadducean fashion, as one who could say nothing better of himself than that he was the God of some dead men who had long ago ceased to exist! These dead men must have been still in existence when God was speaking to Moses. A God who could not keep his friends alive after death was certainly not the powerful God of the Hebrew scriptures: "He is not a God of dead persons, but of living persons. You are very much in error!" The reference to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob seems, on the face of it, to prove simply continued existence after death, not necessarily the "resurrection" that the Sadducees are represented as denying (v. 18). It may be that by "resurrection" was meant the passage from the dark shadowy realm of the dead into a desirable state of being, an experience through which the patriarchs mentioned are conceived to have already passed. Or it may be that the scripture cited is thought to prove that they are certain to participate in the general resurrection when it shall occur. Jesus' reply was greatly admired by the people (Mt.), even by some of the scribes (Lk.).

The violence of the attack on Jesus by representatives of

[12] Acts XXIII:8.
[13] Ex. III:6.

the Great Council seemed to be abating. The approach of the scribes and Herodians had revealed deadly intent. The resurrection question raised by the Sadducees was more academic, though not without hostile animus. It in turn was now followed by another academic question, this time raised by a Pharisee. It was natural for rabbis to discuss the relative importance of various commandments in the law. One of the Pharisean scribes, glad to see that Jesus had disconcerted the Sadducees (Mt.), now tested his skill as a teacher by asking him which he considered to be the prime commandment.[14] Jesus at once replied that it was the one commanding Israel to love God supremely, and volunteered a further reply in which he said that the second ("like" to the first, Mt.) was the one commanding men to love their neighbors as themselves.[15] The meaning of these commandments has already been discussed. The Matthew Gospel seems to imply (in accordance with V:18-19) that these two commandments sustain, and involve obligation to keep, the whole law: "On these two commandments hang the whole law and the prophets." The scribe expressed himself as much impressed by Jesus' reply, and Jesus in turn assured him that he was not far from being ready for the Kingdom of God. Jesus had talked in the same way to the rich young man of whom Mark said that Jesus "loved him" as he looked at him.[16] Both incidents reveal the keen desire Jesus had to bring the scribes over to his ideal of the righteousness of the Kingdom of God; they show that it had not been easy for him to be true to his inner convictions at the risk of antagonizing them.

[14] Mk. XII:28-34, Mt. XXII:34-40, *cf.* Lk. X:25-28.

[15] Deut. VI:5, Lev. XIX:18. The combination is found in Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs, Dan. V:3, "Love the Lord through all your life, and one another with a true heart"; *cf.* Issachar V:2, VII:6.

[16] Mk. X:21.

CHAPTER XXXI

JESUS DENOUNCES THE JERUSALEM SCRIBES

JESUS had bodly attacked the priests for their maladministration of the temple. Soon after he directly attacked the Jerusalem scribes on the ground of incompetence and insincerity as religious teachers. In his public teaching at the temple he criticized the Son of David conception of Messiahship that many of them held. He represented it, at least in the form in which they held it, to be contrary to scripture. He quoted Ps. CX: 1, assuming the current idea that David was its author. In the psalm David is understood to say that the Lord God had assigned to his (David's) Lord Messiah a seat at God's right hand until such time as God should lay all the Messiah's enemies prostrate at his feet.

> "The Lord said unto my Lord,
> Sit thou on my right hand
> Till I make thine enemies the footstool
> of thy feet."

Jesus asked how David could in this way apply the worshipful title "Lord" to his son. It was contrary to oriental ideas of propriety that an ancestor should so humble himself before a descendant: "He, David, calls him Lord, whence then is he his son?" [1] The scribes seem to have been unable to answer this question. The answer that

[1] Mk. XII:35-37, Mt. XXII:41-46, Lk. XX:41-44.

Jesus would probably have given, if he had cared to give an answer, is that the Messiah is to be a much more exalted personage than the Son of David whom the scribes expected; he was to be the "Son of Man," or "that Man" from heaven. As has been suggested before, Jesus' final interpretation of his own wonderful religious experience was that into him had come the mighty Spirit of the heavenly Son of Man (p. 229). This was now the secret of the inner circle of disciples, and was not known to the people whom Jesus was addressing.

Jesus' language here does not imply, as is sometimes said, that he was not a descendant of David. The belief in his Davidic lineage could hardly have been so common among the early Christians, if he had been known to have disclaimed it. He was not the Messianic Son of David, but he was a Davidite into whom the Spirit of the heavenly Son of Man had entered. Paul recognized Jesus' descent from David, but he did not hold the Son of David view of Messiahship; he held what was really the Son of Man idea, although not expressed by that title.[2]

The title "Son of David" was unattractive to Jesus. It yielded itself too easily to the ambitions of military Messianism. David had been a great warrior who gave his people standing among the nations by his military campaigns. It was particularly desirable just now, when the scribes and priests were trying to make Jesus politically an object of suspicion among the Roman officials, that he should disclaim any such military ideas. He brings out the fact that it was the scribes who taught the Son of David type of Messianism, and it was, therefore, they that might well bear the burden of sinister Roman suspicion.

Does Jesus' reference to the Messiah's exaltation to the

[2] Rom. I:4, *cf.* I Cor. XV:47.

right hand of God while waiting for the overthrow of his enemies imply anything regarding Jesus' outlook on his own future? He clearly anticipated death and a speedy reappearance in full Messianic power, perhaps at the general resurrection (p. 237). Was he also anticipating that after death he would in some way be taken to God until the victorious phase of his Messianic career should be reached at the time of the general resurrection? The wonderful sense of direct contact with, and full possession by the powerful will of God, which had become central and dominant in his consciousness must necessarily have shaped his forecast of a career after death. How detailed this forecast was we have not data to determine.

Jesus carried his attack upon the Jerusalem scribes still further in a public address before great crowds assembled in the open courts about the temple. He warned the people against their influence. "And in the hearing of all the people he said unto his disciples, Beware of the scribes." [3] In unsparing language, which may often have raised a laugh from the sympathetic element in the crowd, he exposed their weakness at vital points of character. While he may have recognized the sincerity and high ideals of many scribes he seems to have been thoroughly convinced of the hypocrisy of the scribal leaders in Jerusalem. They had earlier brought to Galilee the official opinion that the Power within him, which produced such mighty results and which seemed to him so surely to be the sacred gift of God, was from hell (p. 118). Now in Jerusalem, when his sense of Messianic commission from God was so fully developed, he found them watching for a chance to kill him. In the honesty of his soul, he found now no place for any course except open and unsparing denunciation. In no other way could he

[3] Mk. XII:38-40, Lk. XX:45-46.

it. The scribes now presume to exercise this function. They gather about the gateway into the Kingdom of God, keys in hand, and shut it before men.[12] But Jesus, the Messianic head of the Kingdom, has given this power to his apostle Peter. The authority to "bind" and "loose" the commandments of the Mosaic law is later conferred by Jesus upon the Twelve in exactly the same language used here in conferring it upon Peter.[13] Probably in the source used by the compiler of the Gospel the sentence occurred only as a commission to all the apostles.[14] It was repeated by the compiler in reference to Peter alone perhaps because he wished to emphasize for his readers the fact that Peter rather than Paul was the true authority on this point.[15] In any case there was no thought of any "successors" of Peter or of any of the other

[12] Mt. XXIII:13. "Woe unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because ye shut the Kingdom of Heaven before men." The verb translated "shut" means to lock with a key, "kleis," keys, "kleio," to shut.

[13] Mt. XVIII:18. With emphasis upon the power to admit into, or exclude from, the "church," a power logically involved in the power to interpret God's commandments.

[14] Perhaps it was a part of Q omitted by Lk. because "binding" and "loosing" were terms unfamiliar to Gentile readers.

[15] The passage seems like a reminiscence of the situation in Syrian Antioch, where Peter and Paul had been in sharp conflict over the question of how much liberty Christians might exercise in their relation to the Mosaic food laws. We know from Gal. II:11-14 that the feeling was very tense. Paul and Peter contended in an open meeting and party lines were sharply drawn between the partisans of each. It is probable that these parties continued for some decades, and with more hard feeling than had originally existed among the leaders. The Jewish Christians of this region, among whom the Matthew Gospel was very possibly compiled (p. 16), would be glad to seize upon any appreciation of Peter expressed by Jesus and would have felt justified in so shaping it as to make it support their contention that Peter and not Paul was the true authority in determining the proper application of the Mosaic law to the conduct of Christians. They felt perfectly sure that this would have been the verdict of Jesus.

apostles. The whole conception embodied in the passage rests upon the pre-supposition that the Kingdom of God, the New Israel, will soon come in the form of the New Age, and in this New Age there will be no death and consequently no need of "apostolic successors." The God of the present age, Satan, is against the Kingdom but he and his officials, sitting in the gates of Hades,[16] will not prevail against it. They will not be able to swallow it up in their dark realm of death or oblivion.

The reason why Jesus wished to conceal from the public his new consciousness of being the Messianic Son of Man was the fact, soon to be considered, that he had developed a conception of the Messianic career very unlike that commonly held by the people. He did not wish to be thought of as Messiah until his conception of Messiahship should be understood. If so popular a prophet had publicly anounced himself as the Messiah, crowds would have flocked to him expecting from him the various things that they naturally expected from the Messiah. His inevitable failure to meet this expectation would have produced bitter disappointment and a feeling of resentment that would have shut their minds against his religious teaching. Furthermore such a proclamation by such a prophet would have created a popular excitement that would have brought Roman soldiers at once into action. Their presence would have roused the fighting spirit among a people always ready for revolt. It was uncompromising disapproval of such a program that had kept Jesus out of the Judas revolutionary movement. The only possible way for him to proceed was to keep his Messianic consciousness the secret of the inner circle until God should act in some notable way.

[16] Oriental officials held court in the gates of the city; the Turkish government has been "The Sublime Porte."

as to make life a painful burden: "they tie heavy burdens on the shoulders of men," while they themselves sit back in comfortable ease watching them stagger along and enjoying the consciousness of being hard taskmasters. To be set over others gives them satisfaction! They stand outside the gateway of the Kingdom of God, dignified, self-appointed gate keepers, refusing to have the humble spirit really necessary for their own entrance and locking the gate against others who could easily be made ready to enter. They make expensive journeys by land and sea as missionaries of Pharisaic Judaism to gain an occasional convert from among the Gentiles, but the poor convert, when won, is "twofold more a son of hell" than the missionary who converted him. These alleged religious guides are keen to make queer and unreasonable distinctions between various forms of vows, and to measure out with eager exactness the sacred tenth of the smallest garden seeds, but they are utterly obtuse in transactions that call for the fair play ("justice"), "mercy" and wholesome "faith" in God and man, out of which spring all true life and religion. They are ostentatiously conscientious in trivial matters and grossly slack in fundamentals. They anxiously strain out of the liquid in the cup the minute insect that might be "unclean" food, but they gulp down a camel without a quiver! They care only for appearances; they are like dishes carefully polished on the outside but disgustingly dirty on the inside. With their long prayers and malicious hearts they are like grave chambers in the rock, carefully whitened outside but having within the stench of decaying corpses, the bones of the dead and all the "unclean" crawling life of the tomb. They hold up hands of pious horror over the conduct of their ancestors who killed the great prophets, but in so doing they truly confess that they spring from a prophet-killing breed.

(Luke says that they complete the work of their fathers: their fathers did the killing, they do the burying.) [8] The groups of malicious scribes found in the synagogues and temple courts now intent on murdering Jesus, are like broods of venomous snakes; they are destined soon to be in hell! The end of the age is near. Upon this last bloody generation, guilty of the supreme murder, will come vengeance for all the righteous blood shed from the time of Abel, the first murdered victim mentioned in scripture, to Zechariah, the last recorded victim, murdered in the temple of God by officials of high standing.[9]

This terrific polemic against the Jerusalem scribes breaks into a pathetic lament over the sullen, hard-hearted, wayward city that Jesus so loved. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killeth the prophets and stoneth them that are sent unto her! How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" He had longed to get the people about him and bring to them the protecting, brooding love of God that he felt welling up within himself. But now God's holy house, befouled by its official keepers, must be abandoned by God to stand desolate until such time as the nation's leaders should be of a different mind, ready to welcome one who should come to them as

[8] Lk. XI:47-48.

[9] II Chron. XXIV:20-21. The Matthew Gospel differs from Luke in calling Zechariah "the son of Barachias." In II Chron. he is called "the son of Jehoiada the priest." Since II Chron., which records the murder of Zechariah, was the last book in the Hebrew Bible, this is like saying, "everything from Genesis to Revelation." According to Josephus, *War*, IV:5:4, a man named Zechariah was killed in the year 67 or 68 A.D., "in the midst of the temple." His father's name, according to different manuscripts of Josephus, was "Bareis," "Barouchos," or "Bariskaios." Perhaps the compiler of the Matthew Gospel had this in mind. It would not have seemed to him unfitting to attribute prophecy to Jesus.

Jesus had now come, in the name and character of the Lord.

Jesus' terrific attack on the pompous, hypocritical great men of the temple and synagogue, which would be reported to their discredit all over the world by Passover pilgrims returning to their homes, was followed by a quiet scene in which he pointed out to his disciples an illustration of a genuinely religious spirit.[10] His keen eye found it in the personality of a poor widow, perhaps one whose house had been "devoured" by greedy scribes. He saw her as he sat watching the rich Jews from all over the world bringing their offerings to the temple treasury. There was a long procession of them and they brought much. Some of them perhaps had their servants carry heavy bags of coin. Among many this lonely woman slipped up with two lepta, very small coins. Jesus learned, probably from conversation with her, the amount of her gift and that it was all she had with which to provide food for herself for the day; she lived from hand to mouth. He at once made the incident the subject of a "teaching" to his disciples, whom he summoned from their strolling about in the colonnades near by. He said that in God's sight she had given more than all the rest put together. She had given all that she had. He who was about to give his all felt a strong bond of sympathy between himself and her.

[10] Mk. XII:41-44, Lk. XXI:1-4.

CHAPTER XXXII

JESUS' PRIVATE TEACHING ABOUT THE DESTRUCTION OF JEHOVAH'S HOUSE AND THE END OF THE AGE

THE idea prevailed among at least a section of the earliest Palestinian Christians that Jehovah, probably in some connection with his Messianic Judgment, would abandon his sacred house to utter destruction. It was understood that Jesus himself had expressed this expectation and had privately given some hints as to the time when this would happen.[1] In the earliest days any Christians who held this expectation were sure to be exceedingly unpopular. We shall see that the Great Court tried to secure the conviction of Jesus on the charge that he had threatened to destroy the temple, but failed to prove the charge.[2] Later the report that Stephen had been heard to say "that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place" resulted in his being lynched.[3] A covert assertion of this expectation was made by circulating the rumor that at the time of Jesus' death the curtain screening off the most sacred room in the temple building had been torn almost in two from the top down, that is, by the hand of God.[4] As the Christian movement grew stronger the expectation of the overthrow of Jehovah's House was openly acknowl-

[1] Mk. XIII:3-4.
[2] Mk. XIV:58-59.
[3] Acts VI:13-14, VII:54-58.
[4] Mk. XV:38.

edged and was definitely set in the traditional teaching of Jesus. It appears in the Gospel narrative at the point to which we have now come.

As Jesus was leaving the temple courts after his terrific attack upon the great men of the temple and the synagogue, the leading priests and the Jerusalem scribes, he remarked to "one of his disciples" (that is, "privately"), "Seest thou these great buildings? There shall not be left here one stone upon another which shall not be thrown down." When they had crossed the Kidron Valley, presumably on their way to their lodging place in Bethany, Jesus stopped on the Mount of Olives, overlooking the temple site across the valley, and talked "privately" with four of his disciples about the coming catastrophe. "And as he sat on the Mount of Olives over against the temple, Peter and James and John and Andrew asked him privately, 'Tell us when shall these things be and what shall be the sign when these things are all about to be accomplished.'" [5] Then follows the famous teaching recorded in Mk. XIII, Mt. XXIV, Lk. XXI: 25-36.[6] Many of the ideas expressed in this teaching, are those that are found in the Jewish apocalyptic literature of the time. The peculiar ideas that appear are such Christian adaptations of general Jewish apocalyptic as would spring naturally out of Jesus' teaching about the nearness of the Kingdom and the assumption of his own Messiahship, together with the startling information that Jehovah's house will be destroyed in connection with the Messianic Judgment.[7]

[5] Mk. XIII:3-4.

[6] Matthew records matter not found in Mark and considerable portions of this are assigned by Luke to an earlier period, *e.g.*, Lk. XII:39-40, 42-46, XVII:23, 24, 26, 27, 34, 35, 37, XIX:13-26.

[7] The theory that there is embedded in this discourse a little Jewish apocalypse which circulated independently and about which as

The discourse, especially in its Matthew form, seems to assume a point of view prevalent later among the early Christians and not that of the Passover week to which it is assigned in the narrative. In the Matthew Gospel the disciples ask him, "What shall be the sign of thy coming and of the consummation of the age?" This question seems to imply an understanding of the fact that he was to die, be raised from the dead, taken into the heavens, and then come from the heavens, although according to the subsequent narrative these things were not at all clear to them before Jesus' death. In Mark's Gospel, which often more nearly preserves the original situation, the indication of this later point of view is not quite so evident. In Mark they simply ask when the destruction of the temple, of which Jesus had spoken, would occur, although it is Jesus' coming as Messianic Son of Man "in clouds" in accord with the later Christian expectation that constitutes the body of the discourse. It may be that the real viewpoint of the four disciples at the time was this: they did not yet understand that Jesus' prediction of death and resurrection was to be taken literally instead of as a kind of parable or "dark saying" [8] (p. 238), but they were convinced that his Messianic demonstration would not be made immediately, as they had hoped. He was perhaps to withdraw again from public life for a time as he had done once before,[9] and then emerge from obscurity, this time clothed with the radiant form and power of the Son of Man from heaven.

The main ideas presented in the teaching may be sketched in brief as these: The Messianic demonstration

a nucleus certain Christian teachings were gathered, seems to have no constraining evidence in its favor.

[8] Jn. XVI:25, 29.

[9] Mk. VII:24, X:1.

is to be preceded by a period of extreme suffering,[10] during which many spurious Messiahs will try to start Messianic movements. They will appear in the wilderness remote from police inspection, or will be found secretly plotting revolutionary movements in inner chambers. No such definitely localized centres of Messianic agitation need attract the serious attention of the disciples. Such phenomena could accompany only a Messianic movement of the Son of David type which Jesus had rejected. He had cast his lot in with the Spirit of the Son of Man, the signs of whose coming were to be sought in the heavens and not on the earth. It would not be secret but open to every one's eyes, like the lightning flash or the hungry eagles flying swiftly from every quarter of the sky to a common destination for food.[11] Wars will be heard of in various parts of the world, and earthquakes and famines; it will be a period of general upheaval and insecurity. These sufferings are merely preliminary to worse suffering; they are the beginning of birth pains. Christians will be killed. They will even turn against each other in hate. False leaders will arise among them. A deadly apathy will come over many of them. During this preliminary period the gospel will be preached over the world. (This would not require any very long time.)[12] An especially terrible and culminating incident in this period of suffering will be something that is to take place in Judæa, evidently the desolating of Jehovah's House. A sign of this will be "the desolation-producing abomination standing where he ought not" (Mk.), something

[10] Mk. XIII:5-23, Mt. XXIV:4-28, Lk. XXI:7-24.

[11] Mt. XXIV:26-28.

[12] Paul a few years later felt that as soon as he had done one more piece of evangelistic work on the western edge of the world, in Spain, the evangelization of the world would be complete, Rom. XV:18-19, 23-28, *cf.* X:18.

"spoken of through the prophet Daniel, standing in a holy place" (Mt.). The early Christians had evidently come to a secret understanding as to what this "desolation-producing abomination" was,—"let him that readeth understand," that is, "we Christians know what this means." What it was is uncertain.[13] The phrase "standing where he (Mk.), or it (Mt.), ought not," might indicate a statue of a man. When this sign shall appear the Christian men in Judæa are instantly to drop everything and flee with their families "unto the mountains," where there will presumably be caves and other hiding places. It is to be hoped that the necessity of this flight will not occur in winter, when streams swollen by winter rains would make travel difficult, nor on a Sabbath (Mt. with characteristic regard for law), when it would be difficult to hire animals for the swift transportation of household goods and families.

Luke, who pictures no "private" conversation of Jesus with his disciples, and who has nothing corresponding to "let him that readeth understand," says simply, "when ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies then know that her desolation is at hand." From his Gentile viewpoint there is to be "distress upon the land and wrath unto this people." This distress will consist in the fact that "they shall fall by the edge of the sword and shall be led captive into all the nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." [14]

[13] Eusebius, the church historian and librarian who lived in Palestinian Cæsarea in the fourth century, had some reason for believing that the Jerusalem Christians, in obedience to a revelation made to approved men there "before the war," left the city and settled in Pella east of the Jordan, *Ch. Hist.*, III:5, 3.

[14] Lk. XXI:20-24. Paul felt that the time for the fulness of the Gentiles to be brought in might be completed in his own lifetime, Rom. XI:25, XIII:11-12.

After this preliminary period of distress, which apparently culminates in the destruction of Jehovah's House, the great event, the Coming of the Son of Man, will take place.[15] It will occur "immediately after the tribulation of those days" (Mt.), "in those days after that tribulation" (Mk.). It will be heralded by the portents commonly described in Jewish literature in connection with Jehovah's Judgment, the dislodging of the stars and the terrifying of their animating spirits. Then at the signal of a trumpet blast the angels of the Son of Man will go over the earth to assemble "the elect." What becomes of those so assembled and what becomes of those who are left, is not stated. It seems to be assumed that every one will be familiar with current ideas on this point. The Matthew Gospel, as we shall see later, presents a more detailed idealized picture of the Judgment scene.[16]

All these things are to happen within the lifetime of the generation to which Jesus belonged. Heaven and earth will pass away, will become a new heaven and a new earth with the dawning of the New Age, but Jesus' words will not fail. However, the exact date within the generation is known to no one, not even the angels of heaven nor Jesus himself. It is the Father's secret: "Verily I say unto you, that this generation shall not pass, till all these things happen. The heaven and the earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away. But of that day or hour knoweth no man, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Whether we have here Jesus' own thought or the thought attributed to him, as a matter of course, by his disciples later, is a question which has already been discussed (ch. xxxiii).

The discourse in Mark ends with a solemn injunction

[15] Mt. XXIV:29-44, Mk. XIII:24-37, Lk. XXI:25-36.
[16] Mt. XXV:31-46.

to the four listeners, and through them to all the disciples, to watch. Special obligation to watch rests upon the four, who are like the gate-keeper of an absent householder. "It is as when a man sojourning in another country, having left his house and given authority to his servants, to each one his work, commanded also the porter to watch. Watch, therefore, for ye know not when the lord of the house cometh, whether at even or at midnight, or at cock-crowing or in the morning; lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping. And what I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch." [17]

In the Matthew Gospel there follows a paragraph [18] not found elsewhere, the parable of the virgins, containing a dramatic warning to apathetic and careless disciples, particularly those holding positions of leadership. In the Matthew Gospel, more than elsewhere, there have appeared denunciatory references to spurious Christians, especially teachers and prophets, lax in their observance of the law, whose counterfeit characters are to be revealed in the Judgment Day.[19] In the words just preceding this parable such faithless leaders have been represented by the character of a drunken head servant who abused the privileges of his position and was consequently excluded from the Kingdom. He went to the abode of the wicked, described in the language of current Jewish literature as the place of "the weeping and the gnashing of teeth." [20] The parable of the virgins also describes persons specially trusted with the responsibility of watching for the arrival of the bridegroom. They had gone out in the early evening to some designated spot to meet him, expecting to join

[17] Mk. XIII:34-37.
[18] XXV:1-13.
[19] V:19, VII:15-23, XIII:41, XXII:11-14, XXIV:10-12.
[20] XXIV:45-51; *cf.* Secrets of Enoch XL:12, the "weeping hell."

him there and proceed with him to the place where the wedding feast would be held. They all prepared to perform this function, but half of them made insufficient preparation. They did not provide enough lamp oil to last through the unexpectedly long interval before the bridegroom's delayed arrival. He finally arrived at midnight when they were all asleep. Those with no reserve oil found their lamps going out. They tried to make good their neglect, but it was too late to do so and they were consequently shut out from the wedding supper.

This parable fits well into the situation that existed in the first decades of the Christian movement when the keen expectation of an immediate return of Jesus from heaven was losing its edge and Christians were becoming apathetic. Was this parable the work of alert Christian evangelists during this period who were sure that Jesus had foreseen its needs and would approve of such teaching as this parable presents? How clearly did Jesus foresee all the development of the Christian movement that took place in the early decades and in all the succeeding centuries after his death? In any case, from the standpoint of either the evangelists or Jesus, what was it that the insufficiently prepared really lacked? The picture of the Judgment scene presented in the last paragraph of this chapter, emphasizes neighbor love as the one thing requisite. From the viewpoint of the Matthew Gospel Jesus regarded neighbor love as involving, and not displacing, obligation to keep all the other commandments. It is one of the two commandments on which "the whole law hangs." [21]

Still as a part of Jesus' "private" teaching to his disciples the Matthew Gospel next introduces the parable of "The Talents," or better, of "The Estate Held in

[21] Mt. XXII:40.

Trust." [22] It is another illustration showing the way in which disciples could successfully prepare themselves for the impending Messianic Judgment, the point at which there was special danger of failure and the sure consequence of such failure. As in the preceding parable of the virgins so here the idea of a delayed coming is emphasized. The owner of the estate came back "after a long time," just as the bridegroom did not arrive until midnight, long after he had been expected to come.

A man who was going abroad converted his estate ("his goods") into cash and left it in trust to three of his servants for investment. He gave five eighths to one, two eighths to another, and one eighth to a third. He made this unequal division as a result of his estimate of each servant's business ability (v. 15). The first two invested the amounts entrusted to them so successfully that when they were "after a long time" called to account, their employer's trust was found to have doubled. He congratulated them heartily, promoted them to positions of greater responsibility and power, and took them into a kind of partnership with himself in what is called his "joy": "Enter thou into the joy of thy lord." Perhaps the phraseology of the application, the joy of life in the Messianic age, is at this point used in the parable itself.

The third trustee made no investment with his trust. He simply put it in the poor man's popular place of safety deposit; "he digged in the earth and hid his lord's money." When he was called upon for an accounting he made a rather ill-natured, sullen defense of his conduct. His lord was a rough man, always expecting to reap harvests that other men had produced. He had been afraid to do business for such a man; he had feared that he might lose what had been entrusted to him. So he had done no

[22] Mt. XXIV:3, XXV:14-30, *cf.* Lk. XIX:12-27.

business at all. He was returning the capital without any interest. His lord called him a "wicked and lazy servant." His "wickedness" perhaps consisted in pride. His pride was hurt because his business ability had been considered less than that of his associates. He would not do what he could with what he had, because others had more. But he was also lazy. It was too much trouble to do business for his lord. His fundamental defect was lack of interest in his lord's business. He did not care if his lord's estate did not increase. His laziness was merely a symptom of an anemic good will toward his lord and his lord's business. He was relegated to the place of idleness, "the outer darkness," in the language of current Jewish literature. The amount entrusted to him for investment was then transferred to the man who had demonstrated his ability to handle the largest share of the estate. The estate must be developed and the opportunity to do this must be given to the man who could and would use the opportunity. In time of famine, when the government is distributing seed to farmers, the little seed that he has received must be taken away from the small farmer who will not sow it, and given to the large farmer who will, for a harvest must be produced. It is a case of either "use or lose."

Here again the question arises, what, in the mind of Jesus, was the meaning of this "parable" in terms of actual life? What was it that was given to these disciples of Jesus that was capable of being increased, for the increase of which they were held responsible, with expectation of larger opportunity if they succeeded and of ruin if they became lax and lazy? Here again, as in the parable of the virgins, the Judgment scene described in the next paragraph suggests the answer. It is neighbor love, friendliness in the simple relations of plain daily life,

that enables men to pass through the Messianic Judgment into the eternal life and light of the New Age. The compiler of the Matthew Gospel very probably thought of this parable as particularly applicable to the inner circle of disciples to whom the Gospel represents Jesus to have given it as private teaching.[23] It would have seemed, therefore, specially applicable to all evangelists and prophets of the Gospel-making period. They must not lose their confidence in the return of the Son of Man from heaven, and they must do their utmost to develop in quantity and quality the body of those who with simple, unostentatious good will awaited his coming.

This private teaching closes with an idealized picture of the Son of Man's Judgment.[24] In its opening sentence and in its description of the fate of the rejected it is very like current Jewish apocalyptic literature, especially the Book of Enoch, which was popular among Christians.[25]

"And he sat on the throne of his glory
And the sum of judgment was given unto the Son of Man,
And he caused the sinners to pass away and be destroyed from
off the face of the earth."

"And he will deliver them to the angels for punishment
To execute vengeance upon them because they have oppressed
His children and His elect."

"And the righteous and elect shall be saved on that day
And they shall never thenceforward see the face of the sinners
and the unrighteous
And the Lord of Spirits will abide over them,
And with that Son of Man shall they eat
And lie down and rise up forever and ever."[26]

[23] XXIV:3.

[24] Mt. XXV:31-46.

[25] In Jude 14 it is referred to by name and certain of its statements regarding the judgment of the wicked are quoted.

[26] En. LXIX:27, LXII:11, 13-14.

In the Matthew picture the Son of Man has emptied all the heavens of all the hosts of his angels and has them assembled in majestic array about his glorious throne in the clouds. Below on the earth the terrified nations have been gathered. Then the line of separation is drawn as a shepherd separates his white sheep from a dark and sinister herd of goats. That which distinguishes the true disciple from the false is what Jesus had always in all his teaching been urging upon those who would prepare for the coming Kingdom, namely, sincere, dependable friendliness in all the commonplace relations of daily life, loving one's neighbor as himself. The teaching represents plain daily life, with its ample opportunity for the exchange of ordinary neighborly kindliness, as a situation devised by God in which to fasten upon men the habits and disposition necessary for participation in the activities of the eternal life of the Age to Come.[27] The Kingdom of God is a democracy in which "the King" calls his true subjects his "brothers" and identifies himself with the least and neediest of them. Of course, no one of them, either good or bad, remembered ever meeting the Son of Man, a glorious radiant being out of the heavens, sick or hungry or in prison. Nevertheless such a being had stood in close relation with the human suffering which they had either relieved or ignored. "Verily I say unto you inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brothers, even these least, ye did it unto me."

[27] It is sometimes supposed that this paragraph pictures the Judgment of Gentiles that had never heard the Gospel. If a Judgment scene in which neither Jews nor Christians appear had been in the mind of the compiler of the Gospel he would have made that interpretation more evident. Unevangelized Gentiles have not appeared in the preceding parts of the teaching. The only reference to Gentiles has been the statement that the Gospel is to be preached in all the world.

CHAPTER XXXIII

THE TREACHERY OF A TABLE COMPANION

THE priests and scribes grew desperate under Jesus' public attacks upon them at the temple before the multitudes of Passover pilgrims that were filling up the city. They felt that he might be tempted by his popularity to take advantage of the presence of these multitudes and head a revolutionary Messianic movement during the Passover week. Even if he should not do this, but should be content with his present self-assumed rôle of prophet, priestly and scribal prestige throughout the nation and all the ghettos of foreign countries would be seriously impaired if the thousands of pilgrims should go home reporting that Jesus' fierce attacks had gone unpunished. It seemed necessary to do something decisive at once. There were only two days left in which to act, for after the Passover week had begun so many of his friends, especially Galileans, would have arrived that it would be unsafe to proceed against him. Even in these two remaining days no open measures could be safely taken against him: "Now after two days was the feast of the Passover and the unleavened bread; and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take him with subtlety, and kill him: for they said, Not during the feast lest haply there shall be a tumult of the people." [1]

[1] Mk. XIV:1-2.

In the carrying out of any plot the priests and scribes greatly needed the help of someone among the inner circle of Jesus' friends. They needed the services of someone who would take him on some pretext to a pre-arranged place where they could seize him, and who would then return to his friends with some plausible explanation of his absence. Just at this juncture they were secretly visited by a man from the inner circle of Jesus' friends, Judas, one of the Twelve, who offered to deliver Jesus into their power. They naturally gave him a hearty welcome and promised to pay him well.[2]

We can only imagine how Judas' mind worked in the process of reaching this determination. The order of arrangement of the narrative in the Gospel of Mark affords a hint. Between the statement that the priests were plotting against Jesus (XIV: 1-2) and the account of Judas' visit to the priests (vs. 10-12), occurs the account of a dinner party in Bethany, the suburb in which Jesus and the Twelve had found lodgings.[3] This peculiar arrangement of the narrative indicates that the compiler saw some connection between Judas' treachery and what took place at this dinner party. While they were at the table a woman brought in a sealed alabaster vase of very expensive liquid perfume.[4] Instead of unsealing the vase she broke it, apparently intending to prevent its ever being used again for any common purpose, and poured the liquid over Jesus' head. The extreme value of the perfume used for this anointing and the fact that she broke the vase,

[2] The Matthew Gospel, perhaps influenced by Zech. XI:12-13, names the price, thirty pieces of silver. If a "piece of silver" was four denarii, thirty pieces would have been about 120 days' wages (Mt. XX:2).

[3] Mk. XI:11, 19.

[4] Its cost was estimated as equal to 300 days' wages. Mk. XIV:5; *cf.* Mt. XX:2.

indicate that she intended by this action to express the hope that Jesus would this week declare himself to be the Messiah, "The Anointed," and inaugurate a Messianic movement.

Some of those present (Mt. "the disciples") became very indignant at this proceeding. If they recognized the delicate suggestion of her act they perhaps felt that it was not a woman's business to be meddling with politics. Any such suggestion might far better come from them. In any case they objected to her absurdly expensive way of making the suggestion. They felt sure that Jesus would be displeased with such a use of money. They had repeatedly heard him say that money ought to be given to the poor. They had recently seen him turn away a very attractive applicant for discipleship because the man would not make this use of money (p. 283). But to their surprise Jesus called her act a "noble deed." He did not relax his habitual concern for the poor. "You have the poor always with you and whensoever you will you can do good to them." But in the present crisis another motive ought to prevail. It was a time to show loyal affection to himself. In the city powerful men were shrewdly plotting his execution. Dissatisfaction and resentment were growing in the heart of one of his table companions. At such a time the one great and noble thing to do was to express unswerving loyalty to his person. At a later time when men should look back upon this great crisis in God's On-coming Kingdom with true apprehension of its meaning, her deed would everywhere seem memorable. "Verily I say to you wherever the gospel shall be preached in all the world also that which this woman has done shall be spoken of in her memory." The disciples had been willing to invest their money in the poor as a means of gaining remunerative offices in the New Age. "Lo we

have left all and followed thee; what then shall we have?" [5] This woman had nothing of the sort to gain by Jesus' elevation to power; she simply loved her Lord and wished to see him honored.

Another outstanding feature of the incident was Jesus' consciousness of the nearness of his Messianic death. Everything that he saw reminded him of it. This glad pouring of the perfume on his person was, to his mind, the beginning of his preparation for burial. They will soon in sadness be wrapping sweet smelling spices in his grave clothes and drenching them with liquid perfume. This scene to him is prophetic of an immediate entombment rather than an enthronement.

All this was extremely offensive to Judas. It was the last straw in the growing burden of Jesus' offensiveness to him (p. 220). It was clear to him that Jesus was not equal to the crisis which his reckless harangues at the temple had produced. In spite of his bold words he was nothing but a queer sentimentalist, fond of extravagant attention from women, ready to tend babies, full of weak foreboding in the face of danger, unequal to the administration of a great world empire. Especially Jesus' idea that there was no place for rich men in the Coming Kingdom had offended Judas. He bitterly resented the loss of the time he had spent with Jesus. He had during all these months been kept from business and money making by the hope which he now considers to be baseless. According to the Gospel of John he was custodian of the meager funds available for meeting the expenses of the Twelve [6] and, therefore, may have looked forward to being Treasurer of the Realm in the New Age. He may often have pictured to himself Isaiah's vision of long proces-

[5] Mt. XIX:27.
[6] Jn. XII:6, XIII:29.

sions of dromedaries loaded with treasures, and great fleets of ships carrying multitudes of Jewish passengers, "their silver and their gold with them," all hurrying to him, Jehovah's Treasurer, in Jerusalem, the world's capital.[7] All this now seems to him to have been an idle dream. He will reimburse himself as far as he can and cut loose from the foolish movement. It may be that he did not expect that his action would really lead to Jesus' death. Jesus' popularity, which made it seem to the priests and scribes so difficult to dispose of him, would naturally have seemed to Judas likely to open for Jesus some way of escape. According to the Matthew Gospel, when Judas later became convinced that this was not to be the case he bitterly regretted his action. He made an unsuccessful effort to return his blood money to the priests, and then in desperation apparently broke into the sacred enclosure and threw it into the very temple building itself, as if calling God to witness that he had not kept the money. He then went out and hanged himself. In the Gospel-making period a field near Jerusalem, called the "Blood Field," was popularly associated in two traditions with the death of Judas.[8] Judas' regret may have been occasioned not only by his certainty that Jesus was a good man, but by the fact that he found himself to be no patriotic hero in the eyes of the priests! He was to them simply a contemptible man who had betrayed a table companion for money.

The enemies of Jesus must have rejoiced at the prospect of getting Jesus into their possession in this particular way, through a table companion. They were likely to be very unpopular after they had secured the death of so popular a prophet. But now the people would feel sure

[7] Is. LX:4-9.
[8] Mt. XXVII:3-10, Acts I:18-19.

that Jesus must have been guilty of some outrageous misconduct which the priests and scribes had fortunately discovered, something so bad that even a table companion had felt obliged to turn against him!

CHAPTER XXXIV

JESUS' LAST SUPPER WITH THE TWELVE

ACCORDING to the first three Gospels Jesus' last meal with his twelve table companions was the annual Passover supper eaten once a year by many thousands of pilgrims who came from all over the world to Jerusalem for this purpose. It was a joyful feast eaten in the early part of the night by groups of from ten to twenty [1] to commemorate the nation's flight in the night when God delivered them from Egyptian bondage. The menu of the feast, as nearly as can be ascertained from general biblical allusions to it [2] and from detailed post-biblical descriptions of it in the Talmud,[3] was very simple and dramatically symbolic. It consisted of "unleavened" bread suggestive of the traditional hurried exit from Egypt when there had been no time to use yeast in the baking; a lamb roasted whole without breaking a bone or cutting off the head, bringing to mind the lamb's blood sprinkled on the door-case of each faithful Hebrew family on the night of the great exodus when God "passed over" the blood sprinkled houses and did not stop as elsewhere to deal out death to any luckless first born. In addition to these two principal articles of food there were four cups of wine for each person; salty water to be used with a variety of bitter herbs such as usually constituted an ap-

[1] Jos. *War* VI:9:3.
[2] Especially Ex. XI:4-XIII:16.
[3] Talmud, Tract Pesachim (Passover).

petizing side dish;[4] and a pasty mixture of crushed fruits and vinegar flavored with spices, thought to be suggestive of the clay used by the Hebrew bondmen in their brick making.[5] Into this dish morsels of food were dipped. At certain times during the meal the cups of wine were drunk; there were various prayers of thanksgiving and blessing, a recital of parts of the national history before and after the great exodus and the chanting at different times of parts of Psalms 113 to 118 and 136.[6]

In the early part of the day Jesus commissioned two of his disciples (Peter and John, Lk.) to make preparation for the supper. They had first to secure a suitable room. According to the Matthew Gospel Jesus was counting on a certain friend in the city to furnish a room. "And he said, Go to the city to So and So and say to him, the Teacher says, My time is near; at your house I keep the Passover with my disciples."[7] According to Mark's Gospel the process by which the room was secured was more mysterious and is perhaps, though not necessarily, represented to have involved supernatural insight on the part of Jesus. The two disciples were told that in the city they would meet a man carrying a water jar, apparently a somewhat unusual sight. They were to follow him home and say to his master that "the Teacher" wished to engage a room in the house. It is implied that the

[4] G. E. Post, *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. I, p. 304. Sometimes thought to be suggestive of bitter bondage, *e.g.*, Oesterley and Box, *Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, p. 359. Rabbi Jonathan said, "Why are the Egyptians compared to bitter herbs? Because as the bitter herbs are first soft and then hard, so were also the Egyptians; at first they treated the Israelites with kindness and afterwards with harshness?" Tract Pesachim, ch. II.

[5] Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien.*

[6] See Art. "Passover," H. D. B., and Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.

[7] Mt. XXVI:18.

householder was acquainted with "the Teacher." Jesus seems to have intended, either by previous arrangement with this householder or through supernatural insight, to keep all but two of the disciples in ignorance of the place where the supper was to be eaten. It will appear later that Jesus knew something about Judas' treachery and did not propose to let the temple police find out through the traitor where he might be found and arrested before the supper was ended. For some reason he especially desired to eat this supper with his disciples. "I have greatly desired to eat this Passover with you before my suffering," he said to them that evening at the table.[8]

The preparations for the supper, so far as they were not made by the householder himself, involved chiefly securing a lamb that would pass the inspection of the temple authorities, getting it properly killed at the temple,[9] and roasted. Thousands of lambs were killed early enough in the afternoon, after the regular daily sacrifice, to allow time for roasting. Jesus' two disciples would have been busy during most of the day making these preparations.

Toward evening the two men reported to Jesus that everything was in readiness for the supper and the eleven men (perhaps also a few others) were conducted by the two guides to the house. Three unusual features characterized the supper: Jesus discussed the terrible treachery of a table companion; he spoke with dramatic impressiveness about his death in two acted parables, the parables of the Broken Bread and the Red Wine Poured Out; and he took a solemn pledge never to drink wine again until they should meet at the Messianic banquet in God's New Age.

The natural joy of the occasion disappeared when Jesus assured them that one of their own circle, bound to him

[8] Lk. XXII:15.
[9] Tract Pesachim, Ch. V. Art. Passover, H D B and H D C G.

by the sacred ties of table companionship, would put him into the hands of his powerful enemies. Someone who then and there was dipping his morsel of bread and herbs into the same dish of sauce with Jesus would do the dreadful deed. If there were on the table more than one dish this specification narrowed the possibilities to a small number in the immediate vicinity of Jesus. According to the Matthew Gospel Judas was seated so near to Jesus that when everyone began to say "Surely not I, Lord?" he could ask the same question and receive from Jesus an affirmative reply not overheard by the others. Jesus' strong words about the terrible character of the act, "good were it for that man if he had not been born," were a powerful final appeal to Judas not to do the dastardly deed.

At some point in the meal Jesus, his mind charged with the thought of his death as it had been at the social supper lately given in his honor in Simon's home (p. 352), took a cake, or wafer, of unleavened bread, asked God's blessing upon it, solemnly broke it into pieces which he gave to them, saying as he did so that the pieces were his "body." This saying, like many of his parables, was hard for them to understand. How came he to be speaking of his "body"? The paschal lamb was before them on the table, or, if he was speaking at a later stage in the supper, the pieces of the lamb were there. The disciples might, therefore, have naturally thought of his body, so soon to be lifeless, as a sort of paschal sacrifice offered on the threshold of the New Age of Messianic liberty as the paschal lambs had originally been killed on the threshold of national freedom from Egyptian bondage. The emergence of "many" into God given liberty (*cf.* Mk. X:45) as the result of his Messianic death was to be the thought uppermost in their minds as they ate together.

After his solemn words about the broken bread he took a cup of wine and, again after prayer, gave it to them to drink, saying as he did so that it was "covenant blood." This covenant would naturally be understood to be the "new" covenant (so Lk. and many readings of Mt.), for the Messiah's "New Age" was the time when the "New Covenant" would be made. The Old Covenant was the one made by Jehovah and his people at the foot of Mt. Sinai when the people covenanted to keep Jehovah's law and he promised by implication to bless them.[10] A covenant was made binding by the application of blood to the contracting parties. At Mt. Sinai part of the blood of the slaughtered oxen was put on the altar representing Jehovah, and the rest on the people. In the present situation Jesus speaks of his death, symbolized by the blood-like red wine poured out in the cup, as something that binds men and God together in a New Covenant, one in which men promise loyal hearty obedience to God and his Messiah, and God promises the blessing of his forgiveness and of his continual presence and spiritual help. In the New Age with its new heaven and new earth God will tabernacle with his people, wipe their tear stained faces and bring them tender comfort. The picture that was suggested to the minds of Jesus and his disciples by this mention of the New Covenant was that which we have in the Revelation: "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth are passed away. . . . Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he shall dwell with them and they shall be his peoples, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God; and he shall wipe away every tear from their eyes; and death shall be no more, neither shall there be mourning nor crying nor pain any more; the first things (the things of

[10] Ex. XXIV:1-8.

the present age) are passed away." [11] As these young Jews on Passover night listened to Jesus, they would instinctively have thought of the prophet's famous prediction of the New Covenant: "Behold the days come saith Jehovah when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt. . . . But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days saith Jehovah: I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor and every man his brother, saying, Know Jehovah; for they shall all know me from the least of them to the greatest of them, saith Jehovah, for I will forgive their iniquity and their sin will I remember no more." [12] It was with an intense expectation of such an Age, soon to dawn upon the world, that the hearts of these religious patriots in the upper room were thrilled by the words of Jesus about the New Covenant. We men of the modern western world, who do not have their Jewish pre-suppositions, find it difficult to put ourselves in their places and feel the excitement of the occasion. Nothing was said by Jesus about the way in which his death would serve to bring God and men together in close covenant relationship. The disciples had not yet accepted the expectation of his literal death, and were of course not able to think about its meaning. A germ idea was presented in parable form and men have been left to interpret the solemn parables in the light of developing Christian experience.

[11] Rev. XXI:1, 3-4. *Cf.* Ps. of Solomon XVII:23-38.
[12] Jer. XXXI:31-34.

The third peculiar feature of the occasion was Jesus' solemn pledge that he would never drink wine again until the company should re-assemble at the victorious Messianic banquet when they would drink it "new" in the "New Age," when all things should become new.[13] Jesus was able to look across his dark death now so near and see the light of the New Age which he felt sure his death would introduce. The Luke Gospel, in the text as we have it, represents Jesus to have been handed a cup of wine sometime before he spoke the parables of the Bread and the Red Wine, and with this cup in hand, to have made the solemn vow of an abstinence that began at once. He did not drink any of this cup himself nor presumably did he later drink the cup which symbolized the poured out blood. "And he received a cup and when he had given thanks he said, Take this and divide it among yourselves, for I say unto you, I shall not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God shall come." [14] Then follow later the parables in action of the Broken Bread and the Red Wine Poured Out.

There is no evidence in Mt. and Mk. that Jesus meant this ceremony to be repeated and some manuscripts of Lk. omit the words, "This do in remembrance of me." In Paul's First Letter to the Corinthian Christians, written some twenty-five years later, and a considerable time before our Gospels in their present form came into existence, he states that he had "received from the Lord" an account of the original Lord's Supper according to which the future celebration of the Supper was distinctly commanded by Jesus: "For I received of the Lord that which

[13] *Cf.* Rom. VIII:18-25.

[14] Lk. XXII:17-18. There are several interesting questions of textual criticism that cannot be discussed here.

also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks he broke it, and said, This is my body which is for you: this do in remembrance of me." [15] If Paul "received" this "from the Lord" through the early Christians at the time when he himself became a Christian, then this statement is evidence that the Lord's Supper was being observed as an ordinance of Jesus a few years, or possibly not many months, after the death of Jesus. "Received from the Lord" might possibly indicate a revelation made through prophets in the Christian cult meeting by the Spirit of the Lord. If so, then Luke,[16] following Paul's statement in I Cor., would naturally incorporate the command into his account of the Last Supper. According to the Acts, "the breaking of bread" was a religious practice at first observed daily, and at a later time on the first day of the week.[17] If this daily or weekly "breaking of bread" was the "Lord's Supper" then the "Lord's Supper" was not, in the minds of the early Jerusalem Christians, closely identified with the annual Passover supper; otherwise it would have been celebrated but once a year.

According to the Gospel of John the Last Supper of the Synoptic Gospels could not have been the Passover supper, but must have been eaten the night before the Passover. According to the Gospel of John Jesus died in the afternoon at the time when Passover lambs were being killed at the temple for use in the Passover supper to be eaten that evening.[18] This Gospel describes a last meal (ch.

[15] I Cor. XI:23. Many texts read "which is broken for you."

[16] Or some Gospel scribe, since the sentence is not found in all copies of Luke's Gospel.

[17] Acts II:42, 46, XX:7.

[18] Jn. XVIII:28; *cf.* XIII:29. This is also the representation of the Peter Gospel fragment.

XIII) eaten the evening of Jesus' arrest, without giving any details about what was eaten or any hint that it was the Passover supper. There are some incidental indications in the Synoptic Gospels themselves that their Last Supper was not the Passover supper, although, as we have seen, they explicitly identify the two.[19] A last supper eaten twenty-four hours before the Passover supper would have about it an atmosphere charged with the thought of Passover sacrifice, and the utterances attributed to Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels would be appropriate to such an occasion. Such a supper would naturally have been secretly arranged, for Judas was then already looking for a chance to betray Jesus. Such a supper would naturally have given rise to the early Christian custom of the daily meal eaten with remembrance of Jesus' last table companionship with his disciples and of his solemn pledge of abstinence from wine until the time of the Messianic banquet. Each at the daily meal would know that in the minds of all was the thought, "Till he come!" When the Passover came the next year and the years immediately following, Jewish Christian families might naturally have incorporated into the Passover ritual certain features of the Christian cult meal and so in time the idea might have prevailed in some circles that the original Last Supper had been the Passover supper.

Whatever be the real facts regarding the origin of the Lord's Supper, its value to us is the same. The loving

[19] It is thought that the Sanhedrin would not have met and tried a case on the holy Passover day (which began in the evening in which the supper was eaten); the disciples would not have been carrying arms on a holy day, Mt. XXVI:51; Joseph could not have bought anything in the bazaar, Mk. XV:46; the annual release of a prisoner in the morning of the day when Jesus was crucified was presumably that he might be free to eat the Passover the following evening, Mk. XV:6-15, etc.

remembrance of our Lord and the spirit of united consecration with which we eat the bread and drink the cup are due to something in him and his relation to us far more vital than an explicit, arbitrary commandment!

CHAPTER XXXV

JESUS ARRESTED IN THE OIL PRESS GARDEN

AT the end of the supper, to which Jesus had given such a strange turn, the men chanted a hymn and then came down from the upper room. The friendly householder was thanked for his courteous hospitality and the group started in the late evening toward their lodgings in the eastern suburb on the Mount of Olives. It at once became evident that Jesus felt himself to be in immediate danger. He had spoken during the supper of treachery within the company of his table companions. He spoke now of a blow to be struck out of the dark at him, their leader, within the next few hours. It would be a deadly attack that would send them all flying in fear from his company.[1] They all earnestly assured him that he could depend on them whatever might happen. Especially Peter, apparently his most forceful friend, who had held the group about him in previous emergencies (pp. 223, 286), assured him that he would stand faithfully by even if the rest should leave him. But Jesus solemnly assured Peter that before sunrise he would on three separate occasions deny having any connection with him. Jesus, who had some time before found corroboration in the scriptures for his growing expectation of a violent death is represented here to have cited an appropri-

[1] Mk. XIV:26-31, Mt. XXVI:30-35, Lk. XXII:28-38. Luke here, as in all his account of the last week, shows the influence of another source in addition to Mk.

ate prophetic utterance: "I will smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered abroad." [2] At the same time Jesus was as full of hope as he had been a few moments before when at the supper he spoke confidently of their reassembling at the victorious Messianic banquet. He said that after the catastrophe he was to be "raised up" and would precede them into Galilee, their old home, and expect to meet them there.[3] He wished to comfort them beforehand in anticipation of the chagrin they would feel as they should look back upon their cowardly conduct. What he meant by being "raised up" they could not understand.

On their way to the Mount of Olives they stopped at a place named Gethsemane, or "Oil Press," according to the Fourth Gospel a "garden" which Jesus frequently visited.[4] At the entrance to this place he left eight of his disciples to wait while he went farther into the garden to pray. He took with him Peter, James and John, but soon left them and went on a little farther to face God alone in one of the deepest religious experiences of his life. He seemed to be stationing these two groups as if in anticipation of some attack to be made upon him. He told them to "watch." He spoke more intimately to the smaller group regarding his feelings. He told them that he was experiencing a distress of spirit that seemed like death to him. They reported afterward that he seemed almost frightened ("amazed," *cf.* Mk. XVI: 8) and exceedingly sad. He "began to be greatly amazed and sore troubled. And he saith unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death." The three could easily see him in the

[2] Zech. XIII:7.

[3] Luke omits this reference to Galilee and in his subsequent narrative gives no hint that Jesus after his resurrection visited Galilee.

[4] Mt. XXVI:36-46, Mk. XIV:32-42, Lk. XXII:39-46, Jn. XVIII:1-2.

light of the full moon (Passover came in the full of the lunar month) and could hear the words of his prayer. He fell repeatedly to the ground on his face and "prayed that if it were possible the hour might pass away from him." He used the Aramaic word for father, "abba," which seems to have been combined with the Greek word in the common usage of the Greek-speaking Christians, especially in prayer.[5] "And he said, Abba-Father, all things are possible unto thee; remove this cup from me; howbeit not what I will but what thou wilt." He had at an earlier time been convinced that God intended him to bring in the Kingdom through suffering a violent Messianic death in some sense "sacrificial" (p. 241). This idea had just appeared in the two acted parables of the Last Supper. But he knew that God was resourceful and possibly had in reserve some other available way. If not, he was ready to go steadily on in the way of pain. If there was to be any other way it would naturally be expected to open now, in time to save the traitor from the full guilt of consummating his treachery.

What was it that caused Jesus' extreme distress of spirit? What was the experience that he hoped God, with all the resources at his command, might show him some way to avoid? And why did this terrible distress of spirit begin at this time rather than earlier? It seems hardly possible that the physical pain of crucifixion was what Jesus dreaded. Many martyrs have faced such a prospect without the terrible gloom and fear that Jesus experienced. The fact that the treachery, and consequent moral ruin, of a long time table companion were involved may have added to the poignancy of his distress. It was this that he had just been emphasizing at the Last Supper and this that was uppermost in his mind a few moments later:

[5] *Cf.* Rom. VIII:15, Gal. IV:6.

"Arise, let us be going. Behold, he that betrayeth me is at hand!"

But there may well have been something deeper down in the soul of Jesus. He had finally been forced by the compulsion of his inner religious experience with the will of God to the distinct consciousness of a leadership that was best described in current phraseology by the word "Messianic" (p. 226). Messiahship was to him no merely official relationship, but a warm, elemental sense of direct personal contact with the will of God and with the life of the nation. He *felt* the will of God and he *felt* the life of his people, and not only of his people but of the world. Any Jewish leader would know that the Kingdom of God was a world empire. A Jewish leader of Jesus' profound religious feeling and insight would necessarily look out upon the life of all men with keenest interest. In the Jewish and Gentile life all about him in Palestine he saw what the life of man was; his inner contact with the will of God made perfectly clear to him what God would have it be and made him feel his own unique personal responsibility of leadership in God's way of making life what it ought to be. He directly felt the deep feeling of God about the wrongdoing of men, and conceived it in terms of human love, that is, in terms of a Father's love. It became his own feeling. He felt the feeling of the Heavenly Father about the wrongdoing of his human children. Since God is a Father, one element in the composite consciousness of God, as his life presses close up against brutal human selfishness, must be suffering. Therefore as the vast consciousness of God pressed up for genuine vital expression in the receptive soul of Jesus it caused Jesus profound suffering. In the representation of Luke it caused the sweat to drip from his body in great drops as drops of blood fall fast from a dripping wound.

The disciples must have afterward reported that Jesus came to them, his clothing drenched with perspiration.

No really new facts about human selfishness came to Jesus' attention at this time, but this selfishness was swiftly coming to a fierce concrete expression. Toward him, the conscious embodiment of the mighty, righteous, loving will of God the Heavenly Father, the hate, treachery and moral cowardice of his human children were even then stealing through the darkness to strike a death blow. To feel the feeling of God in such a situation seemed more than he could endure. In response to his prayer to be spared any further experience of such suffering a degree of relief came. Perhaps new tides of strength from the strong underlying life of God rose within him. Perhaps the pressure upon his soul of the element of pain in the vast composite consciousness of God abated somewhat.[6]

Three times in the dark hour he returned to his three friends, presumably to talk with them and find comfort, but each time he found the tired men sleeping.[7] His special reproach was for Peter, who had just before given such vehement assurance that he would surely stand by. Temptation to the disloyalty of which Jesus had just before been warning him was near. He ought to have been watching and praying in preparation for it. Jesus dealt considerately with him. The "spirit," or better nature

[6] The writer of Hebrews says that Jesus prayed to be delivered "out of death," that is to be delivered out of the realm of the dead, so that 'his soul should not be left in Hades.' In that case the speedy resurrection in three days was conceived to be God's answer, Heb. V:7, *cf.* Acts II:27. In the circle from which Luke's source came it was believed that God must have sent an angel to strengthen him. Apparently then as now men reverently speculated about the nature of this impressive experience.

[7] Luke with his usual reverence for "the apostles" says that "they were sleeping for sorrow."

of a man, gives willing assent to duty, he said, but the "flesh," or lower nature, is weak in carrying out the spirit's good intent.

When Jesus returned the third time his watchful eye saw the flickering torches [8] of an approaching company in the distance and he sharply brought the drowsy men to their feet by saying: "Do you sleep on, then, and take your rest? Enough (of sleep)! The hour is come! Behold the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners!"

The Synoptic Gospels give no account of what Judas had been doing in the last hour or two. Apparently as soon as he could do so he slipped away from the supper out into the night [9] and hurried away to the waiting priests and scribes with information regarding Jesus' whereabouts which he had not been able to give them before. He led a company of temple police and servants of the High Priest,[10] perhaps first to the house he had just left, hoping to find Jesus still there. When they found that Jesus and his company had left they started for the lodgings in Bethany, but stopped on the way in the Kidron Valley at the Oil Press Garden which, according to the Fourth Gospel, Judas knew to be a favorite resort of Jesus.[11] Judas at once stepped forward and fervently [12] kissed him either on hand or cheek. Luke shrinks from saying that the traitor's defiling lips actually touched Jesus. In the Matthew Gospel Jesus addresses him by a title which expresses a courteous recognition of relation-

[8] Jn. XVIII:3.

[9] *Cf.* Jn. XIII:27-30.

[10] There was a cohort of Roman soldiers with their chiliarch in addition to officers of the Jews according to Jn. XVIII:3.

[11] Mk. XIV:43-52, Mt. XXVI:47-56, LK. XXII:47-53.

[12] An intensive form of the verb, used also of the father's kiss in the parable of the Prodigal Son, Lk. XV:20.

ship and either asks him why he is there, or more probably bids him do at once, without the mockery of a kiss, what he has really come to do. The officers instantly stepped forward and placed Jesus under arrest. Judas had warned them to tie him up promptly and securely,[13] fearing either some exercise of unusual power on the part of Jesus or that Jesus would slip away in the confusion if his disciples should make vigorous resistance. In the excitement of the moment one of Jesus' friends (Peter, according to John's Gospel) drew his dagger, struck at the high priest's servant, who was perhaps doing the binding, and slashed off his ear. (According to Lk. Jesus healed it by a touch.) Jesus objected (Mt.) to this well-meant attempt at defence on the ground that those who resort to the sword shall perish by the sword. This sounds like an appeal to fear that is unlike Jesus. He had warned his disciples that they must all bravely expect to perish by the cross [14] and perishing by the sword would not be essentially different. Perhaps his meaning was that to use the sword in such a situation would only result in a bloody free fight in which disciples would be killed without accomplishing anything vital, since God meant to have his Messiah die. He had said so in the scriptures. If God had not meant to have his Messiah die he could have sent to the defence of Jesus as many legions of fighting angels as there were apostles. "Thinkest thou not that I cannot beseech my Father, and he shall even now send me more than twelve legions of angels? How then should the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?" [15]

[13] Mk. XIV:44.

[14] Mk. VIII:34.

[15] Mt. XXVI:53. In Lk. XXII:35-38, Jesus at the Last Supper had warned them that a time was coming when they would need to make all possible provision for meeting danger and hardship. In picturesque language he had said, "Sell your cloak and buy a

After having repressed this incipient purpose to fight, Jesus turned upon the arresting party and accused them of cowardice. They had not dared to arrest him openly, during the daytime, when he had been teaching every day in the temple colonnades. Instead they had attacked him by night with knives and clubs as if he had been a robber! His indignation may have been aroused by recognizing in their action a shrewd scheme to cheapen him by proceeding against him as one who was a disreputable character, rather than to ascribe to him the dignity of a false prophet or a spurious Messiah. Indications of this policy will appear again later.

When the disciples found that Jesus proposed to repress all efforts at defence and to surrender quietly, they speedily escaped in the darkness rather than surrender with him. The officers might naturally have wished to arrest all the party to keep them from bringing information about the arrest of Jesus to his friends in the city. According to the Fourth Gospel Jesus requested the officers not to arrest his disciples.[16]

Mark alone mentions a half dressed young man who was nearly arrested, but escaped in the struggle, leaving his single garment behind him. The incident must have had some special interest for Mark's readers, and the fact that nevertheless the name is omitted has led to the possible supposition that the young man was John Mark himself. The last supper may have been eaten in his father's house, which was later used as a meeting place for the early Jerusalem Christians.[17] Perhaps when Judas

dagger." They called his attention to the fact that they had two daggers in the company. He did not stop to explain that his language had been purely symbolical and simply said "That will be a plenty!"

[16] Jn. XVIII:8.

[17] Acts XII:12.

brought the arresting party to the house and found Jesus gone, the young man wakened from sleep, caught up a sheet ("linen cloth") and ran ahead to warn Jesus in the place to which he heard Judas proposing to conduct the police.

CHAPTER XXXVI

THE TRIAL OF JESUS

ACCORDING to all three Synoptic Gospels Jesus was at once taken to the High Priest,[1] the president of the Jewish high court, or sanhedrin. Members of this court had either already gathered expecting Jesus, or were in their homes awaiting the president's summons. Mark and the Matthew Gospel give a somewhat detailed account of the trial, which occurred in the night, but was followed in the morning by a second session in which either the proceedings of the night session were formally ratified or arrangements were made for proceeding quickly to the office of the Roman procurator whose endorsement was legally necessary.[2] In Luke's Gospel there is only one session of the court, and that after daybreak.[3] Luke's account gives much less of detail than that in Mark and Matthew.[4]

[1] Called by Josephus, Joseph Caiaphas, and assigned by him to a period approximately 18-36 A.D. Ant. XVIII:2:2, 4:3.

[2] Mk. XIV:53-65, XV:1, Mt. XXVI:57-68, XXVII:1-2.

[3] Lk. XXII:54, XXII:66-XXIII:1.

[4] In the Fourth Gospel there is no trial at all before the Jewish Court. In the house of Annas, an ex-High Priest, father-in-law of Caiaphas the High Priest, Jesus was asked some informal questions either by Annas or Caiaphas; our text leaves it uncertain by which. (The Sinaitic Syriac text places our v. 24 between vs. 13 and 14, and so represents the questioner to have been Caiaphas.) Jesus, in a manner which seemed to the bystanders too independent, refused to answer these questions (Jn. XVIII:19-22). The examination led to no decision. Annas sent Jesus bound to the house of Caiaphas

When the court assembled it was found that there were no witnesses at hand whose testimony was sufficient to convict Jesus on any serious charge. A number of witnesses had been secured but their testimony was not sufficiently accordant to meet the requirements of the court's rules of evidence. This scrupulousness of the court in this particular does not always receive the recognition it deserves. There were conscientious sanhedrists, who like Rabbi Saul later in lower courts, sincerely regarded Jesus as an irreligious man doing unspeakable damage to the religious life of the nation.[5] These men would be scrupulously honest in scrutinizing evidence. On the other hand there had evidently come to be bitter personal antagonism to Jesus and there may have been in and about the court those who were eager to assemble witnesses without careful inquiry as to their credibility.

According to Mark, followed pretty closely by the Matthew Gospel, there were several stages in the trial. There was first a period in which all the members of the court, led by the president and his kinsmen, looked about for

who, apparently without further examination, took him early in the morning to the office of the Roman procurator. The procurator, who recognized that there had been no Jewish trial, offered to the Jews the privilege of trying their prisoner themselves; "Take him yourselves and judge him according to your law." This privilege they did not care for inasmuch as such a trial could not legally issue in his execution (XVIII:31). Perhaps by the time when the Asiatic Fourth Gospel was written Jewish communities in Asia had no such right of initiating serious prosecutions as had existed at an earlier time in Palestine, and the account was, therefore, modified to suit current usage.

[5] "I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth. And this I also did in Jerusalem: and I both shut up many of the saints in prisons, having received authority from the chief priests, and when they were put to death I gave my vote against them." Acts XXVI:9-10.

witnesses. They found many, but they did not agree in the details of their testimony. "Now the chief priests and the whole council sought witness against Jesus to put him to death; and found it not. For many bore false witness against him, and their witness agreed not together." What they testified to is not stated—presumably to alleged instances of law breaking, especially Sabbath breaking which had long before been seized upon by the Galilean scribes as deserving death (p. 114). A certain group testified that Jesus had spoken disrespectfully of the temple as an inferior building "made by hands," perhaps a covert slur upon the part the evil Herod had played in its construction; he had further boasted that within three days he would replace it by another, a better one, built in some miraculous way, "made without hands." This was a charge calculated to exasperate people generally.[6] If Jesus could have been duly convicted on this charge, his popular following would have largely fallen away from him, while the priests and scribes would have been exonerated from all blame for their hostility to him. His recent assumption of authority in the temple (p. 311), could have been turned to account against him. But the witnesses did not agree in the details of their testimony.

Then the president himself tried to induce Jesus to defend himself against these miscellaneous charges, hoping that Jesus would say something on the spot that would furnish ground for his conviction. Jesus refused to speak. He did not propose to have his case pulled down to the level of any cheap charge.

Finally, when Jesus seemed likely to escape conviction, the High Priest asked him directly a question that was in all their minds, but that they had hoped not to raise. Their great fear had been that he would be tempted by

[6] *Cf.* Acts VI:12-14.

his popularity to indulge in a Messianic ambition. The High Priest now probed directly toward this point in the consciousness of Jesus: "The High Priest asked him and saith unto him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed" ("the Son of God," Mt.)? To this question Jesus at once made an unhesitating reply. He said that he was the Messiah, a Messiah of the Son of Man type, and that his judges would soon find the present situation reversed. He would be coming in the clouds of heaven to judge them. "And Jesus said, I am; and ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power and coming with the clouds of heaven." [7] Instantly the High Priest tore a rent in his robe, apparently a usual piece of dramatic symbolism expressing his indignant abhorrence of the prisoner's guilt. He charged Jesus with blasphemy, and the court without hesitation voted the death sentence. To pose as a patriotic revolutionary Messianic leader was probably technically not blasphemy. But it was considered blasphemous in the case of such a man as the court conceived Jesus to be, a flagrantly irreligious person, a law breaker acting in league with Satan to seduce God's people from God's service. This would especially be so in the case of one who asserted himself to be a Messiah, not of the Son of David kind, but the Son of Man, who was understood to be with God in heaven, hidden away there as God's chief treasure until the time for his

[7] In the Matthew Gospel the reply is, "*Thou* hast said," or "Hast *thou* said so?" This may be a simple affirmative reply, or it may be that Jesus put the responsibility of the public revelation of the Messianic secret that he had so faithfully kept, upon the High Priest: "You, not I, have said it." The Matthew Gospel also adds the italicised words, "*Furthermore, I say unto you, from now* shall you see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, etc." The expression "from now," or "henceforth," represents Jesus as recognizing that the end of life on earth is at hand. His admission of Messiahship will result in a death sentence, and in his return to God.

revelation in clouds of glory as Messianic judge of the world should come.

At the close of the trial some, apparently members of the court, began to express their abhorrence or personal spite by spitting upon him. Others proposed in derision to test his supernatural power of prophetic discernment by blindfolding him and asking him to tell who struck him. If he could foresee himself on the right hand of God, or had power to build a temple in three days he ought to be able to see through the bandage over his eyes! Then the officers of the court "received him with blows" and roughly hustled him away to some part of the palace where he could be under guard until daylight.[8]

During the early morning hours Peter had a sad experience. When other disciples at the time of the arrest ran out into the darkness and hid themselves, Peter followed the arresting party at a considerable distance in the rear. He soon slipped into the open court around which the high priest's house was built and mingled with the crowd of lesser officials and servants who had gathered about the large firepot to warm themselves in the chill air of the early April morning on the Judæan plateau. What happened there was reported, with some natural variation of detail, among the early Christians. According to Mark one of the servant girls noticed Peter and said in his hearing that she had seen him with Jesus, referring either to the time of Jesus' arrest or to public

[8] There has been much discussion as to the legality of the process described in Mark. If the mode of procedure given in the Talmud at a later date actually prevailed in Jesus' day, then there were certain departures from it in the case of Jesus' trial. But it is necessary to remember that Mark's account is very condensed and that there is no indication that the Gospel writers saw anything irregular in the details of procedure. It was the feeling of the authorities toward Jesus that seemed to them so inexcusable.

meetings at the temple. Peter at once denied that he had any idea of what could have given her this impression, and soon withdrew into the dark passage way leading from the court yard out to the street. Either in this passage way or after Peter had returned to the group about the brazier, the same young woman saw him and again expressed to the group her sinister suspicion that he was "one of them." Peter again denied it, but very soon the suspicion became general and a number of them taxed him with it. They told him that he was evidently a Galilean. (He had the northern brogue, Mt.) Then Peter, feeling himself in great danger, denied with vehement and solemn oaths that he had any acquaintance whatever with the person they were mentioning. "I know not this man of whom you speak." Just then he happened to hear the second cockcrowing of the early morning, and remembered Jesus' prediction the evening before of a three-fold denial before the time of second cockcrowing. The realization of what he had done seemed almost to break his heart. He left the place and as he went along some unfrequented street, perhaps on his way to Bethany, with his cloak drawn over his face, he "wept bitterly."

Luke, who departs from Mark's order and makes the trial (of which he gives a condensed account) to have been held after daybreak, pictures Jesus waiting in the early morning for trial in some place where he turned about and caught Peter's eye at the very moment of his last denial![9]

Peter was a strong man, true and reliable, who nevertheless at the first sudden onset of temptation might flinch for a time. Years afterward Paul thought that he discovered this trait in Peter (though Peter was then associated with some very respectable persons), and called

[9] With his usual deference for an apostle Luke makes no mention of Peter's oaths.

it by a very disagreeable name which is obscured in our English translation.[10]

Early in the morning, as soon as the Roman procurator was ready for business in his office (probably either in the barracks adjoining the temple courts or in Herod's palace across the city, near the Jaffa Gate), Jesus, still securely tied, was brought before him by the officers of the sanhedrin.[11] The chief priests and elders led the way to see that the procurator did not fail them. His endorsement of the sanhedrin's sentence was necessary before Jesus could be executed.

The procurator's first question, "Are you the King of the Jews?" shows that the charge, as stated by the sanhedrin in its official document, emphasized the political aspects of Messiahship most likely to seem flagrantly offensive to a Roman official. As was seen earlier, Messiahship was a flexible term with a somewhat varying content (p. 40). Jesus' reply, "You say so," seems to be regarded by the narrators as an assent, or at least an admission that the charge was in some sense true. Then the chief priests and elders with oriental intensity began to accuse him violently.[12]

To the procurator's amazement Jesus remained silent. Prisoners usually utilized this opportunity to make a passionate defence or a plea for mercy. Pilate urged Jesus to make some defence. He would probably have been glad to seize upon anything that Jesus might have urged in his defence and used it as a sufficient ground for refus-

[10] Gal. II:11-14, "hupokrisis," *cf.* Mk. XII:15.

[11] Mk. XV:1-20, Mt. XXVII:1-26, Lk. XXIII:1-25.

[12] The Greek may be translated "accused him much" or "accused him of many things." If "of many things," then they detailed various things, *e.g.*, "perverting the nation," "forbidding to give tribute to the Romans," etc. (Lk.), that might be interpreted as evidence of Messianic ambition.

ing his endorsement of the sanhedrin's sentence. According to Mark, he had previous knowledge about Jesus; he knew "that for envy, the chief priests had delivered him up." As an efficient procurator [13] he must have kept posted through spies regarding the popular movement in Jesus' favor. He knew about Jesus' bold attempt a few days before to reform the abuses connected with the priests' administration of the temple and about the weak failure of the priests, through fear of the people, to call him to account. According to the Matthew Gospel he may have had some more definitely personal information about Jesus, perhaps through household servants, for his wife had that night dreamed about Jesus, and sent a message to him while he was hearing the case warning him to have "nothing to do with that righteous man." She would not have "suffered much this day in a dream" about one in whom she had not previously been much interested. Pilate had clearly made up his mind that Jesus was a religious reformer with no political ambition, and was bent on saving him from the malice of the priests.

At one point in the hearing Pilate thought that he saw a way out, even though Jesus refused to make any defence. A crowd came up to his office to request the customary annual release of some prisoner at Passover time. Pilate said instantly with a tinge of humorous sarcasm, "I will release the King of the Jews!" When the priests saw that Jesus was likely to slip through their hands, they hurried about among the newly arrived crowd and urged them to ask, not for Jesus but for an insurrectionist named Barabbas, or according to some readings,[14] Jesus Barabbas, so that the choice may have rather strangely lain between

[13] He held office for ten years, 26-36, under Tiberius, a rather scrupulous Emperor in provincial administration.

[14] *E.g.*, Sinaitic Syriac on Mt. XXVII:16.

Jesus Barabbas and Jesus Christ.[15] When the crowd chose Barabbas, Pilate asked what he should do with "the King of the Jews!" The newly arrived crowd, stirred up by the priests, joined the sanhedrin crowd in a savage shout for his crucifixion. Pilate, unwilling to abandon his desire to release Jesus, tried to argue with them. According to Luke, who emphatically contrasts Pilate's desire for Jesus' release with the officials' desire for his execution,[16] "he said unto them the third time, What evil hath he done?" and proposed to content them by scourging him, and then let him go. But each time they implacably shouted "Crucify him." So finally Pilate, "wishing to content the multitude," released Barabbas and delivered Jesus for scourging and crucifixion. He knew from experience how easily a Jerusalem mob might be excited and how like wild fire the mob spirit might spread among the excitable Passover multitudes. His political interests too were involved. He could not afford to have the high priests report at Rome that he was favoring a dangerous revolutionary leader, whom they in loyalty to the Emperor wished to execute.[17]

Luke prolongs the description of Pilate's connection with the case by narrating Pilate's effort to put off on Herod, tetrarch of Galilee, who happened to be in the city, the responsibility of dealing with a Galilean prisoner. Herod had long wished to see his famous Galilean subject and hoped to have an exhibition made of something from Jesus' repertoire of "miracles"! When Jesus refused

[15] Bar Abba is a common name in the Talmud (Wünsche) and means "Son of a Father," that is, "Son of a Teacher," or some other honorable man. No such significance may have been attached to it in the case of Barabbas.

[16] *Cf.* Acts III:13-15.

[17] *Cf.* Jn. XIX:12-15, and the dramatic interpretation of the whole incident in the context.

to speak even a word Herod as a joke dressed him up in royal robes befitting a king, and sent him back to Pilate. He had no wish to involve himself unnecessarily in a matter that might irritate his own Galilean subjects. The interchange of courtesies led Pilate and Herod to the pleasant settlement of some disagreement that had arisen between them.[18]

Jesus' experience in Gethsemane had convinced him that God had no other way in reserve, and that he must, therefore, go steadily forward to crucifixion. We naturally wish for power of insight that would reveal to us the religious experience through which the soul of Jesus was passing during these bitter hours of the trial before vindictive and cowardly officials. The writer of Hebrews had these hours in mind when he said of Jesus that "he learned obedience through the things that he suffered."

[18] Lk. XXIII:6-12.

CHAPTER XXXVII

THE EXECUTION OF JESUS

AFTER Pilate had affixed his signature to Jesus' death sentence he turned back to the office routine of the day with no consciousness of having fastened his name forever in the history of the race! Jesus was brought by a detail of soldiers into the open court of the barracks, to wait there while arrangements for his execution were being made. Either there or before he left Pilate's presence he was brutally whipped as the first installment of his terrible sentence. In the barracks the whole cohort ("band") was called together to take advantage of an unusual opportunity for sport.[1] Here was a poor Jewish fool who thought himself "King of the Jews!" The soldiers proceeded to treat him like a king. Some officer's cast-off cloak with a suggestion of royal purple in its faded color was thrown over his shoulders; a thorny twig was twisted into a circlet and pressed down upon his head; a hard dry reed was thrust as a sceptre into his hand, which was now unbound ready for crucifixion. They kneeled before him shouting "Hail, King of the Jews" and then suddenly sprang up, spit upon him, and beat him furiously on the head with his own sceptre!

They then led him out of the city, to the place of execution, with two other prisoners, condemned brigands, ready

[1] Mk. XV:16-20, Mt. XXVII:27-31. Luke omits the scene, perhaps as too revolting or inconsistent with his picture of the majestic Lord.

for execution that morning by the same detail of soldiers. The place of execution was called "Golgotha," "The Skull," (Lat. calvaria), a skull-shaped elevation where, apparently, crucifixions customarily took place.[2] On the way to Golgotha they for some reason found it necessary to impress a passer-by to carry the horizontal piece of the cross which condemned men usually carried for themselves.[3] The man was Simon from North Africa, probably a Passover pilgrim lodging in the suburbs. He was naturally, because of this incident, a famous character among the early Christians. Two of his sons, Alexander and Rufus, were evidently well-known Christians in the section of the church in and about Rome for which Mark's Gospel was prepared.[4]

When the group reached Golgotha someone offered Jesus a drink of myrrhed wine [5] (a drink said to have been usually provided by a society of benevolent Jerusalem ladies) apparently given to deaden the pain of the crucified. Jesus tasted it (Mt.), but as soon as he found out what it was would not drink it. He had recently pledged himself to drink no wine until the Messianic banquet. Furthermore, if it was intended to stupefy him he may have refused it because he wished to be in full possession of his powers during these last hours. He could not tell what might happen in them. Since the experience in Gethsemane he probably had no thought that

[2] Mk. XV:21-41, Mt. XXVII:32-56, Lk. XXIII:26-49.

[3] This was later thought to indicate a weakness on the part of Jesus which probably occasioned unfavorable comment by the critics of the gospel. In the Fourth Gospel, for another reason also, pains are taken to eliminate the whole episode, "he went out bearing the cross for himself to the place of a skull, which is called in Hebrew Golgotha." Jn. XIX:17.

[4] In the fifties a Christian man named Rufus lived either in Rome or Ephesus, more probably Rome. Rom. XVI:13.

[5] Mt. influenced by Ps. LXIX:21, says "wine mixed with gall."

God might take him from the cross. (The fact that some of the bystanders thought that Elijah might come to do this, shows that the idea would not have seemed absurd.) But he did not know what chance there might be to communicate with his family and other friends. He knew that some of the women were near by. He may have seen them on the way out, for they appear later in the narrative, grouped within sight of the cross, but far enough away to be safe from insult.

The horrible details of crucifixion are not given in the narrative. It simply says: "And they crucify him." According to some manuscripts of Luke, Jesus prayed for the soldiers who were nailing his hands and feet (Lk. XXIII: 34) to the cross: "Father forgive them for they do not know what they are doing." It seemed to the early Christians a notable circumstance that Jesus had conspicuous evil doers on his right and left hand. He who had associated freely with "sinners" in his lifetime had their companionship also in death.

The narrative contains certain details of what went on about the cross which were probably much dwelt upon by the early preachers. The soldiers, taking their usual perquisite, divided Jesus' clothes among themselves by throwing dice. Some nameless soldier wore, or sold for drink at the wine-shop, the cloak that the sick had longed to touch! The three crosses evidently stood near a highway where many passed by. The priests saw to it that all such should not be influenced by the charge put up over Jesus' head, "The King of the Jews." They were made instead to understand in accordance with the plan of the prosecutors at the trial, that he was one who had made sacrilegious threats against the holy temple. These passers-by shook their heads in sarcastic pretence of pity over the sad downfall of him who had proposed to destroy the

temple and build it again in three days. Will he not, in the exercise of his wonderful power, come down from the cross and save himself! The chief priests and the scribes, members of the high court, gloated over their success; they talked sneeringly among themselves in Jesus' hearing about the preposterous Messianic ambition which they had been fortunate enough to uncover in the trial. He had proposed to be a Messianic deliverer of others, but now he cannot even deliver himself! They leered into his face, only a few feet above their heads, and said, "Let the Christ, the King of Israel, now come down from the cross that we may see and believe!" So low down in apparent degradation was Jesus that even the two brigands on either side could despise him: "They that were crucified with him reproached him."

Luke, who is evidently following a most interesting source of information not used by Mark or the Matthew compiler, gives a different picture of one of the brigands. It is not quite clear how this man's mind worked. He cannot have thought Jesus to be the Messiah, for even Jesus' own disciples gave up that theory when they finally saw him successfully crucified. The man had perhaps been impressed by Jesus' behavior on the cross. Most men in Jesus' place would have hurled down bitter, abusive curses upon their executioners and jeering enemies. But Jesus, as the early church always with devout wonder remembered, "when he was reviled, reviled not, when he suffered, threatened not." [6] The brigand must have regarded Jesus as an extraordinarily good man who was possessed by the insane delusion that he was the King of the Jews. His heart moved out in sincere sympathy with Jesus. He accommodated himself to Jesus' delusion and said: "Jesus, do not forget me when you come to your

[6] I Pet. II:23.

kingdom!" Jesus saw in this expression of sympathy the vital element in faith and assured him that before sunset they would be walking together in the Beautiful Garden.[7]

The crucifixion had begun about nine o'clock. About twelve o'clock the clouds thickened into an awesome darkness that lay like the heavy wrath of God over the whole region until three o'clock. (The Peter Gospel says that "darkness covered Judæa.") The early preachers would naturally remember the words of Amos, the prophet: "And it shall come to pass in that day (of wrath), saith the Lord Jehovah, that I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day." [8]

In the gloom of the awesome shadow a voice loud and tense with pain was heard from the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me!" It was a natural cry from a man in agony and need not be pressed to indicate any deep theological meaning. It is unthinkable that God should have been displeased with Jesus in this hour of his supreme obedience, or that he should have created in the mind of Jesus the delusion that he was displeased with him. This certainly was not the thought of the Pauline section of the early church.[9] The words are the opening sentence of the twenty-second Psalm. The first half of this Psalm describes the condition of a tortured man, or people, and the last half shines with the glory of God,

[7] Paradise was thought to be in the third of the seven heavens; *cf.* II Cor. XII:2-4. Secrets of Enoch VIII. The Peter Gospel fragment represents this robber to have rebuked the soldiers for casting lots over Jesus' garments; they became angry and "commanded that his legs should not be broken, that he might die in torment." The crucified were sometimes battered to death with heavy mallets as a merciful ending of their suffering.

[8] Amos VIII:9.

[9] He became "obedient even unto death, yea the death of the cross. *Wherefore* God highly exalted him," Phil. II:8-9.

in one sentence (v. 28) almost using the phrase "Kingdom of God." That is, the Psalm pictures extreme suffering opening the way for the coming of Jehovah's Kingdom, an idea that had for a considerable time been in the mind of Jesus. He had made a study of the scriptures concerned with the Kingdom of God, particularly those emphasizing Messianic suffering (p. 239). This entire Psalm, with its picture of triumph following suffering, may have been in his mind when he uttered its opening sentence. Luke omits the bitter cry of Jesus, "My God, my God, why has thou forsaken me?" Perhaps it seemed to him likely to be misunderstod by his readers, and furthermore was probably not in the special source which he used in addition to Mark's Gospel.

The name of God, both in its Aramaic and Hebrew form, sounds something like the Greek form of the name Elijah. Some by-standers, perhaps Greek-speaking Jews like Simon of North Africa who had carried the cross, thought that Jesus was calling for Elijah, who according to the Talmud was often expected to appear in time of need. One of these men saturated a sponge with sour wine from the jar standing near for the soldiers' use, fastened it on a stiff reed, and after asking permission from the soldiers, reached it up to Jesus' lips. He proposed to give Jesus strength enough to keep calling on Elijah until Elijah perhaps would come.[10]

At this point Jesus gave a loud cry and died suddenly; he did not gradually grow faint and expire. No one ex-

[10] In the Matthew Gospel there is a different version of the incident. There the bystanders protest against the action on the ground that Jesus' unrelieved distress may serve to bring Elijah. If the Matthew compiler was following Mark here, he may have swerved from him in favor of a popular version of the incident current in oral tradition. In the verses immediately following (52-53) something that was apparently popular tradition appears.

pected the end to come so soon. The crucified sometimes lived until they starved to death.[11] The two robbers, according to the Fourth Gospel, were beaten to death to expedite the execution. Some form of profound mental distress seems to have caused the speedy death of Jesus. Luke only of the first three Gospels attributes words to Jesus in connection with this final strong cry. Jesus trustfully calls upon his Father, and commits his spirit to him in a sentence found in the thirty-first Psalm, a Psalm of deliverance from suffering inflicted by implacable enemies: "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit."

We to whom Jesus is Lord and Savior would, if we could, penetrate into the actual experience of his soul in these hours on the cross. What did the Heavenly Father mean to him in these dark hours of pain and shame? What did men mean to him, the men about the cross, professional executioners, idle spectators, malignant enemies, and the unseen multitudes over all the earth to whom his thought had constantly gone out in the months during which the burden of Messianic world responsibility had fitted itself so closely to his soul? Had he uplifting sense of doing some great thing for humanity? We have in earlier chapters thought of him as being so responsive to the feeling of the Heavenly Father about his human children as to be its perfect expression in terms of human life and death. The pain which is in the heart of God over the brutal wrongdoing of his human children was now to the utmost in the heart of Jesus. It was not simply the pain of stretched tendons, lacerated muscles, and burning thirst. It was chiefly distress of soul. He was feeling the feeling of God about the wrongdoing of mankind. He could have said of himself in this experience, "He that

[11] Eusebius, *Ch. Hist.*, VIII:8.

has seen me has seen the Father." To see Jesus on the cross with some appreciation of the experience of his inmost soul is to look into the heart of the Heavenly Father. The utmost that a Father can do to redeem from his evil ways a son who has gone wrong is in some way to show the son the pain that is in the Father's heart. More and more with our enlarging understanding of God and his Fatherly nearness to human life we see in the Christ on the cross that which shames us into an ever deeper resentment of the evil in our hearts. We come more and more to feel about selfishness as he on his cross felt about it. The chief element in the pain of his crucifixion hours begins at least feebly to form itself in our hearts and we begin to know a little of what it is to be crucified with him. We find ourselves being redeemed from bondage to the evil will. The experience of the great soul of Jesus was so profound that men can only slowly grow up to it. In centuries to come, as new generations of men feel the force of the subtler and more pervasive temptations that await the race in the higher stages of its development, the Christ on the cross will be an inexhaustible and everlasting source of redemption.

It was learned later, perhaps from Christian priests (Acts VI:7), that on this afternoon the veil screening off the holiest room in the temple was torn in two by a rent which, since it was known to have begun at the top, evidently must have extended not quite to the bottom. This impressive circumstance would have easily lent itself to various symbolic interpretations by the early preachers. Perhaps the one most naturally suggested by the context is that since Jesus, in connection with the expectation of his execution by the priests and rabbis had predicted the destruction of the temple, so now at the time of his execution this destruction began, and by an act of God.

The tearing in two of this beautiful curtain, so much admired by Jews (p. 25), marked the indignant departure of God and the beginning of the desolation so soon to follow.

When the Roman officer in charge of the execution saw the impressive circumstances connected with Jesus' death, the awesome darkness and the great cry, he exclaimed "Surely this man was a son of a god." He had heard the Jews about the cross saying that Jesus claimed to be "the Son of God." In ignorance of the Jewish Messianic meaning of the title he used it in the common Roman sense: Jesus was an heroic being who must have had a divine ancestor.[12]

The death of Jesus was witnessed by a large group of women looking on from a safe distance. Three of them are named as persons evidently well known among the early Christians. One of the three, Salome, may have been the mother of James and John (Mt.). According to Luke many men also were with them. The women are described as those who had "ministered" to him in Galilee and had come up with him to Jerusalem for the same purpose (Mt.). This ministry probably consisted in paying, in whole or in part, the expenses of Jesus' visit to Jerusalem. At an earlier time in Galilee, women who had been cured by Jesus expressed their gratitude by such contributions.[13]

According to the Gospel of John, at some time during the crucifixion a group of women, including Jesus' mother, came up within speaking distance of the cross. "The disciple whom Jesus loved" was also with them, and to

[12] Luke makes the officer call Jesus "a righteous man." *Cf.* also Acts III:14.

[13] Lk. VIII:1-3, "They ministered unto them (him) of their substance."

him Jesus committed the care of his mother.[14] As the women watched they saw the two crucified brigands hammered to death by the soldiers who could reach high enough from the ground to break their leg bones with heavy mallets. This action was a concession to the religious scruples of the Jews who did not wish to have crucified men hanging on the cross on the Sabbath. The women, to their great relief, saw that Jesus was not treated in this way and judged that he was already dead.[15] Then all but two of them stole away to their lodgings.

The two who stayed behind very soon saw a dignified, well-dressed gentleman in consultation with the officer in charge of the execution.[16] It was learned later that it was "Joseph of Arimathæa," a wealthy member of the Great Court living in a town a few miles from Jerusalem. Perhaps because he did not live in the city he had not been summoned to the night session of the court and had not taken part in the trial of Jesus. He did not approve of the verdict. He is described as one who "was expecting the Kingdom of God" soon to appear, and had, therefore, been influenced by the preaching of John the Baptist and Jesus. Either openly or in the secrecy of his own heart he was a "disciple" of Jesus (Mt.). He had come up from Arimathæa and soon found his way to the scene of the crucifixion. When he saw that Jesus was dead he went at once to Pilate's office to get a requisition for the body, which he proposed to bury. This was a bold act (Mk.) because the procurator might have decided to arrest some of Jesus' party, and the sanhedrin would certainly make it very uncomfortable for any member of the court that

[14] Jn. XIX:25-27.
[15] Jn. XIX:31-33.
[16] Mk. XV:42-47, Mt. XXVII:57-61, Lk. XXIII:50-56.

opposed their action.[17] Pilate could not believe that a crucified man could have died so soon. He perhaps suspected that Jesus' friends were plotting to rescue him from the cross and secretly nurse him back to health. He accordingly refused to issue the order until the officer in charge had assured him that Jesus was undoubtedly dead.

Joseph bought a fine linen burial cloth at a bazaar, took the body of Jesus down from the cross, wrapped it tenderly in the fine linen and carried it, perhaps with the help of his servants, to a new unused burial chamber (his own, Mt.) quarried out of the rock. He rolled a heavy wheel-shaped stone across the low doorway of the rock chamber to protect the body from dogs or hostile human intruders. The two women watched while this was being done and then went away. It was too late in the day for them to think of caring for the body of Jesus in the way usual at burials.[18]

[17] Perhaps, too, if the Passover was yet to be eaten that evening (p. 362) touching a corpse would prevent his taking part in the sacred supper.

[18] According to the Gospel of John, Nicodemus, a prominent rabbi, joined Joseph in caring for the body of Jesus. The two men wrapped an astonishing weight of spices, brought by Nicodemus, in the burial linen. In John's Gospel the women are not represented as wishing to prepare the body of Jesus for burial.

CHAPTER XXXVIII

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS

THE passionate message of the early Christian prophets and preachers, necessarily expressed in the terms of their own thought world, was that Jesus, who had been so unjustly executed by the ecclesiastical machine, had been lifted by God out of Hades, the underworld of the dead, and set in the place of power at God's right hand in the highest heaven. From this place of power he continually poured into the lives of his disciples still on earth the influence of the mighty Spirit of God, producing various experiences, especially in the cult meeting, called "gifts of the Spirit." "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God unto you . . . ye by the hand of lawless men did crucify and slay: whom God raised up having loosed the pangs (bonds) of death. . . . Neither was he left unto Hades. . . . This Jesus did God raise up whereof we all are witnesses. Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted and, having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this which ye do see and hear." [1]

On his way from the underworld up to the topmost heaven Jesus is represented to have stopped on earth for a short period in which he made himself known to his disciples. This revelation of himself transformed the bewilderment and bitter disappointment, occasioned by his

[1] Acts II:22, 24, 33.

execution, into triumphant hope and expectation of his soon coming again from heaven to earth to inaugurate the Messianic Age of the Kingdom of God. The "gifts of the Spirit," poured out in power from heaven, were the pledges and prophetic beginnings of the Messianic Age when the heavenly Spirit of God was expected to have undisputed control over the lives of all men.[2]

Regarding the nature and circumstances of Jesus' peculiar contacts with his disciples on his way from the underworld to the highest heaven there was probably a variety of views during the decades in which the Gospel material was being shaped by the usage of Christian preachers. There were different ideas as to what in general constituted a resurrection. To some a resurrection meant the resuscitation of the very body laid in the grave or the passage of the soul into another similar flesh and bone body.[3] To some it seemed that such a body would very soon after its resurrection be transformed, in the case of the good into a glorious body and in the case of the bad into an inferior form.[4] Jews of the Alexandrian type expected no resurrection body at all, because death was an escape from all bodily form.[5] These different ideas of a "resurrection" were probably all represented among the multitude of Jews from various parts of the world who within a few weeks or months responded to the preaching of the apostles. Each one who believed in the resurrection of Jesus believed its nature to have been whatever he understod a "resurrection" to mean. The real nature of the resurrection of Jesus was probably as much a

[2] Ps. Solomon XVII:41-46; *cf.* Ephesians IV:8-13.
[3] Jos. *Ant.* XVIII:1:3, *War* II:8:14; II Mac. VII:11, 23, XIV:46.
[4] Apoc. Baruch XLIX:1-LI:16.
[5] Philo, *On the World,* III. So also the Essenes in Palestine, Jos. *War* II:8:11.

matter of speculation among Christians in the first days as it is now.

This divergence of opinion regarding the nature of a resurrection tended in the course of time to produce different accounts of what had actually happened in the case of Jesus' resurrection. The need of precision and historical accuracy in such accounts was not acutely felt during this period because the presence of the "gifts of the Spirit" in the lives of those who joined the Jesus Messianic movement was to them convincing proof of his resurrection. Absorption in the expectation of his speedy return tended still further to make such precision seem unnecessary. They were all looking forward, not backward. It is not surprising, therefore, that there should be a considerable degree of difference in the Gospel accounts of what took place in the days immediately following the execution of Jesus.

Common to them all is the fact that the resurrection, whatever its nature and circumstances, was Jesus' spiritual assurance to his disciples that he was proceeding with the Messianic program, with preparation for the establishment on earth of God's will for the life of man. Exception is sometimes taken to the fact that evidence of Jesus' resurrection was given, according to most accounts, to no one outside the circle of disciples. But there was no occasion to prove to outsiders that he was still in existence. Scarcely anyone except the Sadducees doubted the continued existence of the dead in Hades. The only thing that the first preachers felt the necessity of proving to outsiders was the continuance of Jesus' power as a Messianic leader to work on human life for the establishment of the will of God. This they considered to be proved by the experience of the disciples as they felt and manifested the daily effects of "the Spirit" which, they as-

serted, Jesus had promised to send them from heaven. The "appearances" of Jesus were important as marking the inauguration of this heavenly influence, but they were not the main thing. The main thing was the evidence of Jesus' permanent connection with the life of his disciples after the resurrection appearances. If this evidence had been lacking, the beginning and maintenance of the Christian movement would apparently have been impossible. This evidence consisted partly in certain conspicuous emotional upheavals natural to the temperament, pre-suppositions and religious fashions of the time, but more fundamentally in the profoundly satisfactory beginnings of ethical success—"love, joy, peace, long suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control." [6]

Turning now to the Gospel records it appears that according to all the first three Gospels it was women who first visited the grave chamber and found it empty. These women were two named Mary, Salome (Mk.) and Joanna (Lk.). Late Friday afternoon they had seen from a distance the body of Jesus placed in a grave chamber. Twenty-four hours later in the evening of Saturday, when the Jewish Sabbath had just come to its end, they bought spices in the market hoping that the corpse would still be in such condition early the next morning that they could give it the affectionate anointing customary at burials. They reached the tomb at sunrise after wondering on the way how they could roll back the heavy stone that they had seen rolled across the low entrance Friday evening. To their amazement they found the stone rolled back. When they stooped and entered the chamber they found no corpse there. While they were for a moment uncertain whether friendly or unfriendly hands might have removed the body, they saw a young man wearing a long

[6] Gal. V:22, *cf.* Acts IV:32-35.

white cloak, sitting at their right on the narrow ledge of rock that ran round the room (two men standing, Lk.). He at once urged them not to be afraid, said that he knew they were looking for "Jesus, the crucified Nazarene," that he had risen and that they could see simply the place where his body had lain. Furthermore he told them to tell the disciples of Jesus, and especially Peter (Mk.), that they must go north to Galilee, where Jesus would have preceded them and would meet them as he had previously promised. Luke's Gospel, which had contained no such promise,[7] omits at this point the command to go north, and gives no hint either in the Gospel or Acts of a meeting in Galilee. The appearances he records seem all to have been in or about Jerusalem; the disciples were even commanded not to depart from Jerusalem.

The women instantly left the grave chamber and fled from the spot in fear (also with joy, Mt.), intending to carry the word to the disciples (Mt.). The Gospel of Mark stops abruptly at this point with the statement that "they said nothing to anyone for they were afraid." [8] It is sometimes maintained that the Gospel was intended to end at this point. It is, however, unusual for a Greek sentence to end with a conjunction ("gar"), as would then be the case.[9]

Among the reasons for thinking that verses 9-20 were not originally a part of the Gospel are their omission in certain old manuscripts and translations and their failure to carry on the interesting narrative begun in the verses just preceding. They contain simply a bare catalogue

[7] *Cf.* Lk. XXII:39-40 with Mk. XIV:28, Mt. XXVI:32.

[8] Possibly "afraid of" for the Greek word might be translated either way. In this latter case the Gospel would break off in the middle of a sentence.

[9] It sometimes does so end, *e.g.*, Is. XXIX:11, Septuagint.

of appearances of Jesus, including no mention of an appearance in Galilee that had been promised in v. 7 and that we find in the Matthew narrative.[10] According to the Matthew narrative the women, on their way from the tomb to the disciples, met Jesus himself, clasped his feet in worship and received from him a message to the disciples to meet him in Galilee. At once the eleven disciples went to a place in the Galilean hill country which had been specified by Jesus. When they saw him there they worshiped, or made obeisance to him, "but some doubted." The narrative gives no information as to who doubted or as to how these doubts were removed, but proceeds at once to give Jesus' command to make disciples among all nations of the world. The account reads like a very condensed statement (such as is characteristic of the Matthew narrative in general) of the conviction that formed itself in the hearts of the disciples during these first days of special contact with the Spirit of Jesus, regarding their Messianic Lord's will to prepare men for the coming Kingdom through their preaching. Their extreme unreadiness at once to obey this command appears in the Acts where they stay in Jerusalem until forced out by synagogue persecution. This unreadiness might well have been due

[10] Mt. XXVIII:16-20. The Matthew account of the women's visit to the tomb represents the person whom the women found at the grave to have been "an angel of the Lord." The grave had been opened by an earthquake; the angel of the Lord had rolled away the stone and was sitting on it in lightning-like majesty when the women arrived. It is further said that the guard, granted by Pilate at the request of the Jewish leaders, saw the angel roll away the stone and that some of them ran in terror to report it to the Jewish leaders. These leaders, against whom the Matthew Gospel all the way through has had a pronounced feeling, it now represents to have bribed the guard to say nothing about what they had seen and to report that while they were asleep the disciples of Jesus stole his body, a story said to be still current among Jewish antagonists of Christianity at the time when the Matthew Gospel was compiled.

to the feeling that it was useless to go to other nations with the declaration of Jesus' Messiahship until his own nation had first been convinced. The injunction here in Matthew to teach their converts to keep all the things that Jesus had commanded them included the Mosaic law,[11] and shows that in the circle which produced the Matthew Gospel Jesus was understood to have planned the incorporation of all Gentile converts into a law keeping Jewish nation convinced of his Messiahship. Such a view was a natural one for Jewish Christians to hold even as late as the sixties or seventies. The baptismal formula, "unto the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit," seems unnatural on the lips of Jesus. There is, however, no reason to suppose that it may not have been an established formula among Christian preachers even as early as the fifties,[12] and so have naturally been attributed to Jesus at the time when the Matthew Gospel was compiled.

The Lukan accounts of Jesus' interviews with disciples after his death represent them to have occurred in and about Jerusalem. It is implied that the women did not see Jesus (contrary to Mt.) although they were first to discover the empty grave.[13] The ones who saw Jesus were two friends walking in the country, Peter, and a group of disciples including the eleven. All three of these appearances occurred during the day in which the tomb was found to be empty.[14] The story of Cleopas and his unnamed friend walking in the country has about it the same beautiful atmosphere that characterizes another country scene found also only in Luke, his story of the angels'

[11] Mt. V:18-20.
[12] *Cf.* II Cor. XIII:14.
[13] Lk. XXIV:22-24.
[14] Lk. XXIV:13-15.

songs and the shepherds' joy in the Bethlehem fields at the birth of Jesus.

The experience of the two men is described with an interesting fulness of detail, that does not characterize any other account of the resurrection found in Luke or either of the other two Synoptic Gospels. Luke seems to have put into it, or found in it if it was in his source, a satisfactory exposition of what seemed to him to be the real meaning of the resurrection. Two Jewish patriots in great sadness of spirit were earnestly talking as they walked along a country road in the afternoon. They had been attracted to Jesus because they had regarded him as one who would soon begin a revolutionary movement of a high type, leading to national righteousness and political liberty. They had hoped that "it was he that should redeem Israel." A stranger joined them and asked what they were discussing so earnestly. They stopped to tell him: "they stood still looking sad." They described to him the brilliant career of Jesus as a healer and popular teacher, a "prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people." They told him the sad story of the execution by the ecclesiastical machine, "the chief priests and our rulers." They also told him the strange story of the tomb found empty that morning by the women and of their vision of angels reporting him alive. Then the stranger, in a kindling way, began to argue that they ought to have expected the national deliverer, promised by God to his people, to die and afterward to enter into the glory of the New Age. He cited many statements in the Hebrew scriptures that they ought to have understood to teach this strange unrecognized truth. As they walked on listening to him they came to their village home and hospitably urged him to be their guest since night was drawing on. He accepted their invitation, but when food was served

suddenly assumed the rôle of host, "took the bread and blessed it and breaking it gave to them." Instantly they knew him and he "vanished out of their sight." They at once spoke to each other about the peculiar exhilaration of spirit felt by them as they had listened to the stranger's explanation of the scriptures, apparently an experience that had frequently occurred in their intercourse with Jesus: "Was not our heart burning within us while he spake to us in the way, while he opened to us the scriptures?" They immediately in early evening hurried back to Jerusalem. There they found the eleven and others with them. It is assumed in the narrative that they were not scattered but were assembled in some place known to the two. Before the two could tell their story about Jesus being "known of them in the breaking of bread," [15] they were greeted with the cry that Peter had seen Jesus. Then they told their story and while the others were intently listening to it, Jesus suddenly "stood in the midst of them." They were frightened because they thought they saw a spirit. Jesus quieted their fears by showing them his hands and feet (probably thought of as marked by crucifixion wounds) and by eating a piece of broiled fish, all to prove the reality of his flesh and bone presence.[16] He pointed out to them, as he had done to the two in the afternoon, statements in the scriptures foretelling, as no rabbi had recognized, the death and resurrection of the Messiah. The early Christian preachers based

[15] The double emphasis on "the breaking of the bread" as the act in which Jesus was revealed (vs. 30, 35) suggests that at the Lord's supper in early church life, there was probably unusual activity among those who possessed "gifts of the spirit." Such "gifts" were thought of as coming from Jesus, Acts II:33.

[16] This narrative assumes the resuscitation of the flesh and bone body. So also does the Acts narrative (II:27, 31). Perhaps the ultimate condition of the body of Jesus was thought of as in the Apoc. of Baruch (p. 396).

their arguments on such passages.[17] Jesus then outlined a career of world wide preaching of repentance and forgiveness beginning at Jerusalem where he commanded them to stay until he had reached heaven and sent back to them the Spirit. Then he led them out of the city to the Bethany suburb and, as his hands were extended over them in blessing and his lips moving in prayer for them, he was lifted out of their sight into heaven.

The oldest list of Jesus' appearances to his disciples is that given by Paul in his first letter to the Corinthians,[18] written in the fifties and reporting what was believed by Christians at the time when he became a Christian, a short time after the death of Jesus. In this list an appearance to Peter comes first: "then to the twelve; then he appeared to above five hundred brothers at once"—most of them known to be still living in Paul's day. "Then he appeared to James; then to all the apostles." Women are not mentioned in Paul's account. In the Gospel accounts, too, the connection of women with the event is chiefly as discoverers of the empty tomb and messengers to the disciples rather than as witnesses of Jesus himself.[19]

What shall we say actually happened in these experiences that the disciples are reported to have had with Jesus after his death? There may well have been a degree of idealization, some exercise of a devout imagination, especially in the only long resurrection narrative found in the first three Gospels, the one describing the experience of the two men walking in the country. This seems especially probable in the case of an author who shows such tendency to idealization as appears in the early chapters of Luke's

[17] *E.g.*, Acts II, III, XVII:2-3.

[18] XV:5-7.

[19] Mt. alone represents women to have seen him. In the late ending of Mk. and in John's Gospel, one woman, Mary Magdalene, sees him.

Gospel, whether the songs and visions there recorded be his own creation or selection. But this supposition of a degree of idealization does not at all account for the great central fact. The central fact is that something happened which convinced the disciples that Jesus did not remain in the underworld where the dead were supposed to await the resurrection, but was instead lifted up by God to be Lord of all in the heavens. It would have been natural for the disciples, after they saw that God did not send Elijah to help Jesus on the cross, nor in any other way deliver him from being swallowed up in death, to suppose that he had joined the long succession of martyr prophets. Or if they went further and still believed that the Spirit of the heavenly Son of Man had been in him, they would naturally have settled down to wait for his emergence from the underworld in the general resurrection, whenever that might occur. But this was not what they did. Something happened that was decisive enough to change their disappointment into enthusiasm, to take their thought decisively and suddenly from the underworld to the highest heaven. That which is reported to have effected this change is certain experiences with Jesus himself. On the supposition that this did actually happen, did these experiences involve an appearance of Jesus that could have been recorded by a camera, such words of Jesus as could have been registered by a dictograph? This seems to be a wholly minor matter. The highest personal reality is not necessarily recorded by camera and dictograph. It seems necessary to say that the personality of Jesus was present with such force as decisively to convince his disciples that he was with them and would continue to work with them as the leader appointed by God to establish righteousness in the life of man on earth. The great convictions that arose in their souls out of such an

experience seemed to them, and were, the voice of their living Lord. They began then and there with new and clarified devotion to adopt at any personal cost the simple fundamental, religious and ethical ideals of Jesus: prayer to the heavenly Father, an invincible generous good will to men, expectation of an everlasting life in the Coming Kingdom of God. These were traditional Jewish ideals emphasized by Jesus. That which constituted them pioneers of a new epoch in the history of man, was the fact that they let their affections follow Jesus as Lord and Leader out into the unseen world of the living God. They conceived him to be continuing a profound experience with the will of God while he was still remaining in the sphere of human relationships. They reached out in spirit to take such share in his experience as he had always seemed patiently eager during his days on earth to accord them. In response to such outreach there rose within them out of the unseen world a tide of moral incentive that gave them victorious sense of the beginnings of an everlasting ethical success. Through the Christian centuries the repetition of the essential features of their experience, varying in superficial details with the unfolding life of mankind, underlies the conviction that Jesus of Nazareth is the living Lord and active Savior of the world.

INDEX TO REFERENCES

Genesis
I:2 68
I:3 245
XVII:6 196
Exodus
III:6 327
IV:22-23 43
XI:4-XIII:16 355
XX:4 325
XXIV:1-8 359
XXX:13 273
Leviticus
XIII-XIV 93
XV:19-30 133
XIX:18 328
Numbers
VI:1-5 61
XV:37-41 27
XIX:2 297
Deuteronomy
I:37 72
VI:1-3 72
VI:4-9 27
VI:5 328
VI:13 72
VI:16 72
VII:12-26 74
VIII:3 72
IX:9 73
IX:11 73
IX:18 73
X:12-22 74
XI:13-21 27
XVIII:15 203
XVIII:15 ff. 231
XXI:3 297
XXIV:1 277
XXV:5-6 326
Joshua
XV:8 272
XV:25 144
I Samuel
VIII:4-22 40
II Samuel
VII:14 43
II Kings
I:8 62
IV:42-44 203
II Chronicles
XXIV:20-21 335
XXVIII:3 272
Psalms
XXII 388
XXII:27-28 239
XXII:28 389
LXIX:21 385
LXXXIX:26-27 43
CX:1 329
CXIII-CXVIII 356
CXVIII:22 315
CXXXVIII 356
Isaiah
V 314
VI:9-10 189
VIII:14-15 316
XI 76
XXII:22 231
XXIX:11 399
XXXV:5-6 ..... 67, 214
LVI:7 312
LX:4-9 353
LXI:1 67
LXI:1-2 140
Jeremiah
VII:11 312
VII:31, 33 272
XXXI:31-34 360
XLVIII:24 144
Daniel
VII 43
Hosea
VI:1-2 237
XI:1 43

Amos
VIII:9 388
Micah
VII:6 56
Zechariah
IX:9 298
XI:12-13 350
XIII:4 61
XIII:7 366
Malachi
III:1 76
IV:5-6 .....62, 259
Matthew
II:1 51
III:2 62
III:7-10 16
III:10 62
III:11 64
III:12 62
III:13-15 66
IV:3 73
IV:4 302
IV:7-10 119
IV:23 28
V-VII 150
V:1-2 3
V:3 180
V:3-12 170
V:6 180
V:8 152
V:13 171
V:14-16 172
V:17-19 .....316, 318
V:18 14
V:18-19 .....18, 328
V:18-20 401
V:19 14, 15, 197, 274, 319, 343
V:20 16
V:21-22 172
V:21-48 151
V:22 19
V:23 173
V:25-26 173
V:28-32 173
V:32 .....276, 278
V:33-37 .....19, 153, 173
V:38-42 174
V:43-48 302
V:44-45 155
V:48 155
VI:1 169
VI:1-3 163
VI:1-7 19
VI:1-8 163
VI:1-18 16
VI:5-8 .....163, 164
VI:9-13 165
VI:16-18 .....19, 163, 164
VI:19 180
VI:19-24 160
VI:25-30 302
VI:25-34 .....158, 162
VI:30 159
VI:31-33 .....56, 76
VII:1-5 174
VII:6 19
VII:7-8 156
VII:11 156
VII:12 169
VII:13-14 170
VII:15-23 343
VII:21-23 .....197, 319
VIII:1-4 93
VIII:5-13 .....86, 95
VIII:11 247
VIII:16 84
VIII:19-20 185
VIII:21-22 184
VIII:29 87
IX:8 .....102, 103
X 149
X:2-4 142
X:5 18
X:16-42 146
X:23 250
X:25 145
X:34-37 184
X:35 56
X:35-36 145
XI:2 81
XI:2-6 .....67, 226
XI:3 .....84, 248
XI:9-11 247
XI:11 314
XI:12 61
XI:18 314
XI:19 58
XI:25-27 302
XI:27 306
XI:28-29 303
XI:28-30 171
XI:29 306

XII:22-23 89
XII:28 248
XII:31-32 87
XII:34-35 152
XII:38-41 217
XIII 195
XIII:30 319
XIII:41 .....248, 319, 343
XIII:43 248
XIII:55 56
XIII:55-56 55
XIV:21 200
XIV:28-29 17
XIV:33 225
XV:12-13 14
XV:15 17
XV:20 .....14, 123
XV:22-28 212
XVI 149
XVI:4 217
XVI:6 219
XVI:9-10 202
XVI:13-16 222
XVI:13-20 223
XVI:14 62
XVI:17-19 230
XVI:19 17
XVI:22 265
XVI:28 242
XVII:1 257
XVII:10-13 259
XVII:20 160
XVII:24 17
XVII:24-27 273
XVIII:1-4 .....170, 268
XVIII:1-5 266
XVIII:15 174
XVIII:16-17 175
XVIII:18 .....103, 232
XVIII:19-20 304
XVIII:21 .....17, 268
XVIII:21-22 174
XVIII:22 176
XVIII:23-24 176
XIX:9 .....173, 278
XIX:10-12 279
XIX:16-30 281
XIX:27 352
XIX:28 .....15, 117, 143, 231
XIX:28-30 286
XIX:30-XX:16 287
XX:1-16 57
XX:2 350
XX:11-14 343
XX:17-19 290
XX:20 267
XX:20-28 290
XX:29-34 292
XXI:1-9 296
XXI:9 296
XXI:10-11 298
XXI:11 198
XXI:18-22 320
XXI:28-32 316
XXI:31 288
XXI:38-46 314
XXI:43 .....15, 316
XXII:1-14 317
XXII:10 319
XXII:11-13 197
XXII:12 319
XXII:15-22 323
XXII:23-33 326
XXII:30 279
XXII:34-40 328
XXII:36-37 154
XXII:40 344
XXII:41-46 329
XXIII 163, 332
XXIII:2-3 14
XXIII:4 36
XXIII:4-39 333
XXIII:5 332
XXIII:7b-10 332
XXIII:8-10 .....19, 333
XXIII:12 169
XXIII:13 232
XXIII:15-22 332
XXIII:16-22 19
XXIII:23 .....14, 32
XXIII:37 318
XXIV 338
XXIV:3 .....345, 347
XXIV:4-28 340
XXIV:10-12 343
XXIV:20 15
XXIV:26-28 340
XXIV:29 .....18, 20, 251
XXIV:29-31 245
XXIV:29-44 342
XXIV:34-39 251
XXIV:45-51 343

XXV:1-13 343
XXV:14-30 .....295, 345
XXV:15 345
XXV:31-46 .....342, 347
XXVI:18 356
XXVI:30-35 365
XXVI:32 399
XXVI:36-46 366
XXVI:47-56 370
XXVI:51 363
XXVI:53 371
XXVI:57-68 374
XXVII:1-2 374
XXVII:1-26 380
XXVII:3-10 353
XXVII:16 381
XXVII:20-25 16
XXVII:27-31 384
XXVII:32-56 385
XXVII:52-53 .....7, 389
XXVII:57-61 393
XXVIII:11-15 16
XXVIII:16-20 400
XXVIII:19 18
XXVIII:19-20 231
XXVIII:20 .....15, 316, 318

Mark

I:1-12 99
I:4-5 61
I:6 61
I:9 54
I:12 71
I:13 .....76, 94
I:14-15 81
I:16-20 91
I:16-31 265
I:21 13
I:21-34 84
I:22 82
I:24 87
I:27 .....84, 139
I:29 .....13, 265
I:30-31 86
I:32-38 76
I:34 .....84, 102
I:35-38 93
I:36-38 100
I:41-45 93
I:43 94
I:43-45 76
I:45 .....11, 95
II-III 99
II:1-III:30 208
II:12 .....102, 113
II:13-17 103
II:18-19 71
II:18-22 107
II:19 58
II:23-III:6 111
III:6 .....111, 219, 275, 313
III:6-12 116
III:7-8 11
III:8 .....131, 210, 214, 309
III:10 280
III:12 102
III:13-19 117
III:16 13
III:16-19 142
III:20-21 .....119, 139
III:21 56
III:22 .....118, 217, 275
III:23-30 119
III:27 312
III:28-29 87
III:30 120
III:31-35 .....56, 119, 139
III:35 .....286, 305
IV:1 92
IV:1-34 187
IV:3-8 191
IV:10-12 .....188, 218
IV:16-17 192
IV:18-19 193
IV:21-22 189
IV:23-25 193
IV:26-29 194
IV:30-32 195
IV:35-V-43 .....126, 187
V:28 280
V:30 101
V:37 267
VI:1-6 .....138, 187
VI:3 56
VI:7 4
VI:7-13 .....138, 144
VI:11-13 216
VI:14 276
VI:14-16 210
VI:14-29 .....199, 276
VI:17-29 81
VI:30 4
VI:30-44 198

VI:39 200
VI:45-46 204
VI:52 207
VI:53-56 207
VI:56 280
VII:1 .....121, 275
VII:1-24 .....99, 121
VII:2-4 10
VII:3-4 104
VII:6-13 308
VII:18 265
VII:19 .....12, 14, 123
VII:24 .....123, 210, 339
VII:24-30 210
VII:24-VIII:26 209
VII:31 131
VII:33 261
VII:37 214
VIII:14-21 218
VIII:17-21 265
VIII:19-20 202
VIII:22 261
VIII:22-26 221
VIII:27 102
VIII:27-28 .....89, 205
VIII:27-30 11, 66, 89, 206, 222
VIII:29-30 6
VIII:31 .....11, 227, 252
VIII:31-38 234
VIII:31-IX:1 257
VIII:34 .....241, 371
VIII:34-35 .....168, 252
VIII:35-38 242
IX:1 .....242, 253
IX:2 .....257, 267
IX:2-50 257
IX:8 258
IX:9-10 238
IX:11 62
IX:11-13 259
IX:12 .....11, 239, 259
IX:23 261
IX:26 211
IX:29 85
IX:30 208
IX:30-32 264
IX:31 .....11, 236
IX:32 280
IX:33-37 266
IX:35 268
IX:37 269
IX:38 84
IX:38-40 270
IX:39 144
IX:41 271
IX:47-48 272
IX:50 273
X:1 .....264, 275, 292, 339
X:5-9 278
X:11-12 173
X:12 276
X:13-16 280
X:16 269
X:17-31 281
X:21 .....269, 328
X:27 284
X:28-29 283
X:32 289
X:32-34 .....236, 290
X:35-37 267
X:35-40 223
X:35-45 290
X:41 267
X:42 291
X:42-45 268
X:43-44 168
X:45 .....11, 358
X:46-52 292
XI:1-10 296
XI:9-10 296
XI:11 350
XI:12-14 320
XI:15-18 200
XI:16 312
XI:17 312
XI:18 313
XI:19 .....310, 350
XI:20-25 320
XI:23 85
XI:24 86
XI:25 322
XI:27 313
XII:1-9 187
XII:1-12 314
XII:9 15
XII:12 319
XII:13-17 323
XII:15 380
XII:18 .....34, 327
XII:18-27 326
XII:25 279
XII:28-34 .....33, 328

XII:29-30 154
XII:35-37 329
XII:38-39 .....125, 185
XII:38-40 331
XII:41-44 336
XIII 338
XIII:3-4 .....337, 338
XIII:5-23 340
XIII:9 27
XIII:24 .....20, 251
XIII:24-27 245
XIII:24-37 342
XIII:30-33 251
XIII:34-37 343
XIV:1-2 .....11, 349, 350
XIV:5 350
XIV:10-12 350
XIV:26-31 365
XIV:28 399
XIV:32-42 366
XIV:43-52 370
XIV:44 371
XIV:53 313
XIV:53-65 374
XIV:55 11
XIV:58-59 337
XIV:61-62 11
XV:1 .....313, 374
XV:1-20 380
XV:6-15 363
XV:9-10 11
XV:16-20 384
XV:21-41 385
XV:34 240
XV:38 337
XV:42-47 393
XV:46 363
XVI:8 366
XVI:9-20 .....13, 399

Luke

I:1-3 7
I:1-4 .....2, 92
I:5-6 61
I:15 61
I:39 61
I:80 61
II:1 51
II:1-2 19
II:39 54
II:41-51 54
II:51 54
III:1-2 .....19, 60
III:7 63
III:7-14 63
III:15 64
III:21 68
III:23 60
IV:3 73
IV:5 72
IV:13 79
IV:16-20 58
IV:16-30 140
IV:18-19 .....140, 177
IV:22 19
IV:23 .....140, 187
IV:26-27 18
IV:40 84
IV:42-43 93
V:1-11 92
V:12-16 93
V:17 .....101, 275
V:26 102
V:33 ..... 63, 165
V:36-39 109
VI:12 117
VI:14-16 142
VI:20-25 180
VI:20-49 150
VI:31 169
VII:1-10 95
VII:2-5 46
VII:11-17 136
VII:18-19 67
VII:18-23 226
VII:20 248
VII:26-28 247
VII:28 68
VII:47 158
VIII:1 19
VIII:1-3 392
VIII:15 .....3, 193
VIII:40 19
IX 149
IX:18-21 223
IX:20-21 140
IX:27 242
IX:28 257
IX:32 258
IX:46-48 266
IX:51 19
IX:51-55 143
IX:57 20

IX:57-58 185
IX:59-60 184
X:1 20
X:1-20 147
X:17-19 76
X:21 302
X:25-28 328
X:25-37 18
X:27-28 154
X:28-42 177
X:38 20
X:38-42 180
XI:1 ..... 63, 165
XI:2-4 165
XI:5-6 85
XI:5-8 178
XI:5-9 157
XI:20 248
XI:29-32 217
XI:37-52 332
XI:47-48 335
XII:1 219
XII:10 87
XII:13-21 181
XII:22-31 158
XII:22-34 162
XII:33 180
XII:33-36 160
XII:39-40 338
XII:41 180
XII:42-46 338
XII:50 256
XII:51-53 145
XIII:1-5 153
XIII:6-9 321
XIII:10-17 111
XIII:11 214
XIII:14 27
XIII:16 214
XIII:24 170
XIII:31-32 220
XIII:32-33 237
XIII:33 ..... 19, 318
XIV:7-10 179
XIV:7-14 178
XIV:11 169
XIV:26 184
XIV:33 180
XV 19
XV:7 157
XV:10 157
XV:11-24 158
XV:11-32 178
XV:20 370
XVI:1-12 181
XVI:13 160
XVI:17 18
XVI:18 ..... 173, 278
XVI:19-31 182
XVII:3 ..... 174, 249
XVII:3-4 174
XVII:4 176
XVII:6 160
XVII:11 20
XVII:11-19 ..... 18, 157
XVII:22-37 249
XVII:23, 24, 26, 27, 34, 35, 37 338
XVIII:1-8 157
XVIII:12 108
XVIII:13-14 158
XVIII:18-30 281
XVIII:31-34 290
XVIII:35-43 292
XIX:1-10 292
XIX:11 250
XIX:11-27 295
XIX:12-27 345
XIX:13-26 338
XIX:28-38 296
XIX:37-44 299
XIX:38 296
XX:9-19 314
XX:18 316
XX:20-26 323
XX:26 326
XX:27-40 326
XX:35-36 279
XX:36 43
XX:41-44 329
XX:45-46 331
XXI:1-4 336
XXI:7-24 340
XXI:20-24 341
XXI:24 20
XXI:25-27 245
XXI:25-36 ..... 338, 342
XXI:31-36 251
XXI:38 19
XXII:15 357
XXII:17-18 361
XXII:28-30 287

XXII:28-38 365
XXII:30 117
XXII:35-38 371
XXII:39-40 399
XXII:39-46 366
XXII:47-53 370
XXII:54 374
XXII:66-XXIII:1 374
XXIII:1-25 380
XXIII:5-7 324
XXIII:6-12 383
XXIII:26-49 385
XXIII:34 386
XXIII:50-56 393
XXIV:13-15 401
XXIV:22-24 401
XXIV:30 403
XXIV:35 403
XXIV:51 20

John

I:1 21
I:6-9 64
I:13 51
I:14 21
I:19-20 64
I:26-27 64
I:29-30 64
I:40-41 91
I:41 225
II:13 49
II:15 311
III:1-2 33
III:3-5 21
III:26-30 64
IV:27 280
V:1 49
VI 203
VI:4 .....49, 200, 201
VI:14-15 201
VI:25-29 201
VI:31-32 74
VI:52-58 201
VI:66-71 257
VII:1 289
VII:5 .....56, 139
VII:10-14 289
VII:50 33
VIII:59 289
IX:1 101
XI:4-11 257
XI:41 85
XI:41-42 257
XI:53-57 289
XI:55 293
XII:6 .....267, 352
XIII 363
XIII:27-30 370
XIII:29 .....267, 352, 362
XIV:12-14 305
XVI:25 339
XVI:29 339
XVI:32 263
XVIII:1-2 366
XVIII:3 370
XVIII:8 372
XVIII:13, 14 374
XVIII:19-22 374
XVIII:24 374
XVIII:28 .....49, 362
XVIII:31 375
XIX:12-15 382
XIX:17 385
XIX:25-27 393
XIX:31-33 393
XX:17 305
XX:21 305
XX:23 .....103, 305
XXI 92
XXI:24 22

Acts

I:11 20
I:13-14 142
I:18-19 353
I:21-23 143
II 404
II:17 .....4, 7
II:22 395
11:24 395
II:27 ..... 369, 403
II:31 403
II:33 .... 4, 20, 50, 395, 403
II:42 362
II:46 362
III 404
III:13-15 382
III:14 392
III:16 20
III:21-23 203
III:22 73
IV:32-35 398
V:17 33
VI:3 215

VI:7 391
VI:12-14 376
VI:13-14 337
VI:14 14
VII:38 230
VII:48-50 14
VII:54-58 337
IX:10 259
IX:25 215
IX:34 20
X:1-2 46
X:1-3 259
X:10-16 259
X:25-28 210
X:38 13
XI:3 210
XII:1-2 291
XII:12 .....13, 372
XII:20 209
XIII:1 4
XIII:15 28
XV:1 15
XV:5 15
XVI:1-3 46
XVI:7 20
XVI:9-10 259
XVII:2-3 404
XVIII:9 .....20, 259
XIX:4 64
XIX:13-15 84
XX:7 362
XXI:17 20
XXI:20-22 319
XXIII:8 327
XXIII:11 20
XXIV:27 20
XXVI:9-10 375
XXVII:1 20

Romans
I:3 1
I:4 330
I:16 212
II:17-20 302
IV:25 81
V:7 281
VI:15 318
VIII:15 367
VIII:18-25 361
IX:XI 188, 249
X:18 340
XI 20
XI:1 .....120, 188
XI:8-12 188
XI:25 341
XI:25-27 188
XIII:8-10 173
XIII:11-12 341
XIII:11-14 250
XIV:17 246
XV:18-19 340
XV:23-28 340
XVI:13 385

I Corinthians
I:12-16 65
VI:1-2 103
VII 279
VII:10-11 1
XI:23 362
XI:23-25 1
XV:4 237
XV:5-7 404
XV:25-28 44
XV:47 .....227, 330
XV:50-52 245

II Corinthians
V:6-7 1
VIII:9 1
XI:23-28 1
XII:2-4 388
XIII:1 144
XIII:14 .....18, 401

Galatians
II:11-14 .....16, 232, 380
II:15 36
IV:6 367
V:22 398

Ephesians
IV:8-13 396

Philippians
II:8 306
II:8-9 388

Colossians
IV:14 20

I Thessalonians
IV:11-12 173

II Thessalonians
I:5-10 250
II:1-12 249

II Timothy
III:15 46

Hebrews
IV:15 71

V:7 369
V:8 256
V:8-9 .....49, 300
XIII:12 315
I Peter
II:23 387
Jude
14 347
Revelation ..
II 22
III 22
III:20-21 5
XXI:1 360
XXI:3-4 360
XXII:8-9 5

Aristeas, Letter of 25
Ascension of Isaiah, X-XI.. 224
Assumption of Moses, X:10 45
Baruch, Apocalypse of,
XXIX:5-8 74
XLIX:1-LI:16 .....30, 396
Ecclesiasticus
XXIII:1 43
L 26
Enoch
XVII:41-43 41
XLV:4-5 267
XLVI-XLVIII 43
XLVI:2 41
XLVI:4-6 42
XLVIII:4 42
L:3 45
LI:1-2 252
LXII:11 347
LXII:13-14 .....42, 347
LXIX:27 347
LXIX:29 42
XCI:9 44
Enoch, Secrets of
VIII 388
XL:12 343
IV Esdras
VII:26-44 44
XIII 43, 227
I Maccabees
I:56-57 58
II Maccabees
VII:11 396
VII:23 396
VII:37-38 241
XIV:46 396
IV Maccabees
I:7-12 240
VI:29 241
XVII:21-22 240
Sibylline Oracles
IV:24-33, 162-170 45
IX:164 ff. 63
Solomon (Pharisees), Psalms of
XVII:23-28 360
XVII:41-46 396
XVIII:4 43
Solomon, Wisdom of
II:16, 18 43
Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs 39, 64
Levi, IV:4 44
Issachar, V:2, VII:6.... 328
Dan, V:3 328
Asher, VII:3 44
Benjamin, IX:2 44

Clementine Recognitions
I:54, 60 64
Eusebius, Church History
I:6 53
III:3, 5 341
III:39 12
VIII:8 390
Josephus, Antiquities
XIII:10:6 34
XIV:4:3 34
XIV:8:1-3 28
XV:7:10 276
XVII:8:1 275
XVIII:1:1 35
XVIII:1:3 396
XVIII:1:3 f. 30
XVIII:1:4 34
XVIII:1:5 35
XVIII:2:2 374
XVIII:4:3 374
XVIII:5:2 .....60, 276
XX:2:3-4 46
Josephus, War
II:8 35
II:8:11 396
II:8:14 .....30, 34, 396
IV:5:4 335

V:5:6 24
VI:9:3 355
Justin Martyr, Dialogue
LXVIII 235
LXXXVIII 57
LXXXIX 235
XC 235
Juvenal, Satire
XIV 12, 110
Philo
On the Virtues of Ambassadors, P. 45..... 12
On the Virtuous Man Being Free, XII 35
On the World, III..... 396
Pliny
Natural History, V:17... 35
XVI:26 320
Talmud
Agada der palestinen—eneischen Amoraer, Die, Bacher, III;.616.... 325
Pirke Aboth, II:10 3
Tract Pesachim..355, 356, 357
Teachings of the Twelve Apostles
VIII 107

GENERAL INDEX

Abba Father, 367
Abomination of desolation, 340
Abrahams, I., 68, 111, 113, 277, 325
Alexander and Rufus, 385
Andrew, 92, 99, 143
Annas, High Priest, 374
Anointing of Jesus at feast, 350 f.
Antioch, Matthew Gospel in, 16
Antiochus Epiphanes, 29
Apocalyptic literature, 24
Aramaic Gospels, 8
Aramaic expressions, 122, 135, 367
Aramaic, Son of Man in, 102 f., 113

Bacher, Wilhelm, 325
Baptism of proselytes, 63
Barabbas, 381-2
Barracks, Roman, in Jerusalem, 28
Bartimaeus, 294 f., 297
Beatitudes, 170-2
Beelzeboul, theory of the Scribes, 118-20, 139, 189, 191, 313
Bethany, 296, 310, 350, 379, 404
Bethphage, 296
Bethsaida, 148, 204, 209, 213
Bi-lingual Palestine, 8
Binding and loosing, 103, 231 f.
Burning bush, 327

Caesar, Julius, 28
Caesar's coin, 323-6
Caesarea Philippi, 209, 222, 223, 226
Caiaphas, High Priest, 374, 376-8
Capernaum, 92, 95, 99, 119, 148, 207, 216, 273
Captain of the Temple, 26, 312
Charles, R. H., 24
Chasidim, 29 f.
Chorazin, 148
Church, 175, 230-3
Cleopas, 401
Conder, C. R., 136
Covenants, new and old, 359 f.

Dalmanutha, 209, 216
David and priests' bread, 112
and Psalm CX, 329 f.
Death, Jesus dealing with, 132, 135-7
Death of Jesus, significance of, (See Suffering)
Death, Messianic, in Jewish thought, 234 f.
Decapolis (Ten City District), 132, 209, 213
Deissmann, Adolf, 214
Demons, exorcism of, 83 f., 87-90, 118-20, 129-32, 144, 147 f., 210-12, 259-63, 269 f.

Elder, quoted by Papias, 12 f.
Eleazar and Izates, 46
Elijah, 62, 142, 222, 223, 224, 252 f., 258 f., 389
Elisha, and the loaves, 203 f.
and Naaman the Syrian, 142
Emmaus, two disciples going to, 401-3
End of the age, 243-55, 337-48
Eschatology of Jesus, 243-55, 337-48
Essenes, 34 f., 61

Faith, 86, 96, 100 f., 128, 133-5, 137, 158-60, 212, 260-2, 304 f., 321 f.
Fasting, 107-9
Feeding multitudes, 198-207, 214 f.

Ferrar, W. J., 24
Fig-tree withered, 320-2
Food laws, 11 f., 121-3
Forgiveness, 100 f., 102 f., 123, 174-6, 322
Future life, 305 f.

Galatia, Jewish Christians in, 15 f.
Galilee,
  Early home of Jesus, 53 f., 61
  Jesus' public work in, 81-208
  Jesus leaves, 207 f.
  Jesus' brief return to, 216-18
  Jesus travels secretly through, 264-75
Gehenna, 272
Gentiles in the Kingdom of God,
  Jewish view, 44-6
  Mark Gospel, 10-12
  Matthew Gospel, 14-16, 231 f.
Gentiles in Palestine, 8, 29 f., 37
Gentiles of the synagogue, 45 f., 95, 212
Gerasene demoniac, 129-32
Gethsemane, 365-73
Golgotha, 385
Gospel, meaning of, 2
Gospels, credibility of, 3-8
Gospels, shaped by Christian teachers, 4-7

Healing, Jesus', by prayer, 83-7, 135, 213
  Jesus' avoidance of, 92-5, 214
Hebrews, Gospel according to, 113 f.
Herod Antipas, 81, 115, 199, 210, 218-20, 275 f., 323-6, 382 f.
Herod the Great, 24, 51 f.
Herodians, 114 f., 218 f., 220, 323-6
Holy Spirit, 86 f., 120, 147, 229, 302
  Blasphemy against, 120
Humility, disciples' lack of, 265-73, 280, 290 f.

Idumaea, 116
Izates, the proselyte, 46

Jackson and Lake, 62, 143
James, brother of Jesus, 119
James, of Zebedee, 92, 143, 290 f.
Jeremiah, Jesus reincarnation of, 222, 224
Jericho, 292-4
Jesusalem, visits of Jesus to, 52, 53 f., 81 f., 289, 298
Jesus,
  Birth, 51 f., 70
  Genealogies, 53
  At temple as a boy, 53 f.
  Life in Nazareth, 49-59
  Family, 55 f., 118 f., 138
  Carpenter, 56 f.
  Date beginning public life, 60
  Baptism, 65-69
  Temptation, 70-80
  Prophet and healer in Galilee, 81-208
  Choosing disciples, 91 f., 117 f.
  Sending out disciples, 144-46
  Multitudes eating in brotherhood, 198-207
  Leaves Galilee, 207 f.
  In outland, 209-21
  Brief return to Galilee, 216-18
  Reveals Messianic consciousness, 222-33
  Travels secretly through Galilee, 264-75
  In Peraea, resumes public work, 275-88
  To Jerusalem, 289-99
  Conflict with scribes and priests, 308-28
  Private teachings about end of the age, 337-48
  Last Supper, 355-64
  In Gethsemane, 365-70
  Betrayal and arrest, 350-4, 370-3
  Trial, 374-83
  Execution, 384-90
  Burial, 393 f.
  Resurrection, 396-406
  Healings by,
    Bartimaeus, 294 f.

Jesus,
Healings by,
Centurion's servant, 95 f.
Deaf stammerer, 213 f.
Epileptic, 259-61
Jairus' daughter, 133, 135 f.
Leper, 93-5
Paralytic, 99 f.
Simon's mother-in-law, 86
Ten lepers, 157
Withered hand, 113 f.
Woman bent over, 111
Woman with blood issue, 133-5
See Demons, exorcism of,
Parables of,
Drag net, 196
Friend at midnight, 85, 178
Good Samaritan, 177
Growth of seed, 194
Judgment scene, 346-8
Laborers in the vineyard, 57, 287 f.
Leaven, 196
Lost coin, 157
Lost sheep, 157
Lost son, 157 f., 177 f.
Marriage of king's son, 317-9
Mustard seed, 195
Pearl merchant, 196
Pharisee and publican, 158
Plant uprooted, 14
Pounds, 250, 295 f., 344-7
Rich fool, 181
Rich man and Lazarus, 182 f.
Shrewd steward, 181 f.
Sower, 190-3
Strong man bound, 119 f.
Talents, 344-7
Tares, 196 f.
Treasure in field, 196
Two sons, 316 f.
Unforgivingg servant, 176
Unjust judge, 156 f.
Virgins, 343 f.
Wicked husbandman, 314-6
Teachings of,
Attention, 191-3
Jesus,
Teachings of,
Based on experience, 150 f.
Basis of authority, 306
Beatitudes, 170-2
Brotherhood, 166-83, 200 f., 254, 305 f.
Central trends, 305 f.
Children, 280 f.
Divorce, 173, 276-9
Faith in the Heavenly Father, 159 f.
Forgiving, 174-6
Friendly heart, 172
Fulfilling law, 174
Future life, 326 f.
Golden Rule, 169 f.
God a Father, 155, 165, 200 f., 254, 305 f.
Honest heart, 152 f.
Humility, 265-73, 280, 290-2
Lord's prayer, 164 f.
Love of neighbors, 166 f.
Loving heart, 153-5
Loyalty to Jesus, 183-5
Lust, 173
Money, 160 f., 180-3, 282-5, 336
Paying debts, 173
Prayer, 156 f., 178
Repentance, 157 f.
Revenge, 173 f.
Righteous heart, 151 f.
Self-denial, 168
Servant of everyone, 167 f.
Social courtesies, 178-80
Sympathy, 177
Thankfulness, 157
Trusting the Heavenly Father, 158 f.
Unostentatious righteousness 162-4
See Eschatology, Faith, Kingdom, Law, Suffering.
Joanna, 398
Johanan, Rabbi, 3
John of Zebedee, 92, 143, 290 f.
John the Baptist,
Preaching and baptism of, 60-3, 82 f.

John the Baptist,
Disciples of, 63 f.
Prediction of the Messiah, 64 f.
Baptizes Jesus, 65 f.
Recognition of Jesus' Messiahship uncertain, 66 f. 83 f. 226
Imprisonment and execution of, 81, 199
Not a healer, 83 f.
Jesus' eulogy of, 247 f.
Not in the Kingdom of Heaven, 247 f.
Called Elijah, 259
His spirit in Jesus, 222, 276
Jesus questions Pharisees about, 313 f.
John the Baptist sect, 63 f.
Jonah, 217
Joseph of Arimathaea, 393 f.
Josephus, Works of, 23
Judas, the Galilean, 35, 59-61, 63, 79, 138, 141, 143, 194 f., 308 f.
Judas Iscariot, 143 f., 220, 267, 350-4
Judgment of the Son of Man, 347 f.

Kingdom of God (Heaven)
Jewish idea of, 38-48, 70, 203 f., 266 f.
Jesus' idea of life in, 149-186, 197, 268 f.
Jesus' idea of when and how it would come, 243-55, 337-48
Korban, 122

Law and synagogue, 27
Law of Moses, Jesus' view of, 11 f., 13-17, 94, 96 f., 104 f., 109-14, 121-3, 174, 197, 216 f., 276-8, 282, 318 f., 328, 333, 344
Pharisees' view of, 30-33
Levi, 103-6, 143
Logia of Matthew, 17
Lord's prayer, 164 f.
Lord's Supper, 201, 355-64
Lord's Supper, Not the passover, 362 f.
Love to God, 153-65, 328
Love to men, 166-83, 328
Loyalty to Jesus, 183-6
Luke, 20
Gospel of, 18-21
Special teaching in the Gospel of, 177-86

Maccabean martyrs, introduce new age, 240 f.
Magadan, 216
Magians, 52
Mark, 12 f., 377 f.
Gospel of, 10-13
Late ending of the Gospel of, 399 f.
Mary and Martha, 179 f.
Marys at the empty tomb, 398
Matthew, 103-6, 143, 267
Gospel of, 13-18
Messiah from tribe of Levi, 64
Messianic consciousness of Jesus, development of, 67 f., 76 f., 80, 88 f., 96, 102, 123 f., 204-6, 210, 217, 225-30, 233, 241 f., 253 f., 256 294, 296-8, 300-7, 321 f., 330 f., 339-48, 376-8
Concealment of, 222-33, 240, 294 f., 296, 377
Messianic hope, Jewish, 38-48, 65, 70, 72, 224, 234, 307
Of the Twelve, 266-8
Montefiore, C. G., 122
Moses at the Transfiguration, 252 f.
Messianic prototype, 72-4, 203 f., 205, 207
Mount of Olives, 338, 366
Mysteries, 189

Nain, Widow's son, 136
Nazareth, description of, 54 f.
Jesus' early life in, 50
Jesus' rejection in, 138-42
Nazarite, 61
Nicodemus, 82, 394

Oesterley and Box, 356

Papias, 12, 17
Parables, Jesus' reason for using, 187-90
Paradise, 388
Passover, 355-8
Paul, 1, 19 f., 22, 105, 120, 187 f. 212, 249 f., 279, 318, 340, 341, 361 f., 375
Pella, 341
Peraea, 275, 323
Peter,
  Source of Mark, 12 f.
  Exalted in Matthew, 16 f.
  Called by Jesus, 92
  Mother-in-law cured, 86
  Walks on water, 206
  Confessor and rock man, 223, 230-3, 235 f.
  With the keys, 232 f.
  Misunderstands prediction of resurrection, 238 f.
  Denies Jesus, 378-80
Peter Gospel, 388
Pharisees,
  Origin of, 29 f.
  Teaching of, 30-33, 98 f., 123-5, 281
  Number and influence of, 36
  Early conflicts with Jesus, 98-125
  Asking for a sign, 216-20
  Combine with priests against Jesus, 308-29
  Denounced by Jesus, 329-36
Philip, 143
Pictures, Jewish dislike of, 324 f.
Pilate, the procurator, 153, 380-4, 393 f.
Pompey, 33 f.
Post, G. E., 356
Prayer, 84-86, 92 f., 129, 135, 156 f., 163-5, 178, 204 f., 213, 262 f., 304, 321 f.
Priests, 26, 28 f., 33 f., 220, 313-28, 386 f.
Priests and scribes combine against Jesus, 308-28
Prophets and teachers shaping Gospels, 4-7
Publicans, 37, 103-105, 292-4
Quelle, Source document, 8 f., 17
Rabbinic method of teaching, 2 f.
Ramsay, W. M., 51
Resurrection, current Jewish ideas of, 30, 34, 326 f., 396 f.
  Jesus' view of, 326 f.
  Jesus, expectation of his, 234, 236-8, 265, 289 f.
  Nature of Jesus', 396-8, 404-6
Revelation, Book of, 5, 21
Rich man discouraged, 281-3
Righteousness in relation to God, 150-165
  In relation to men, 166-183, 282-8
  In the heart, 151-7
  Pharisees' ideas of, 31, 101 f., 104 f., 107 f., 109-11, 118, 121, 123 f., 281
Romans in Palestine, 28
Rufus and Alexander, 385
Sabbath, 109-115
Saddouk, see Judas the Galilean.
Sadducees,
  Origin and teaching, 33 f.
  Number of, 36
  Included chief priests, 308
  Resurrection debated with Jesus, 326-8
Salome, 392, 398
Satan, 72 f., 76-9, 83, 118-20, 126 f., 133, 139, 147
Schürer, Emil, 325
Scribes,
  Influence of, 27, 36, 98 f.
  Mainly Pharisees, 36, 308
  Against Jesus, 98-125, 313-36
  See Pharisees
Scribes and Pharisees denounced by Jesus, 329-36
Scribes and priests combine against Jesus, 308-28
Sermon on the Mount, 150, 170
Seventy sent out, 147 f.
Sidon, 116, 123, 148, 209, 212
Sign from heaven refused, 216-8

Siloam, 153
Simon, Jesus' cross-bearer, 385, 389
Simon "the Cananaean" or "the Zealot," 143
Sinners, 36 f.
  Jesus' eating with, 103-6
Smith, G. A., 54 f.
Son of David, 40 f., 117, 227, 294, 329 f., 340
Son of God, 43, 66-68, 70-80, 123
Son of Man, 41-43, 227, 238, 340
  Jesus the, 102 f., 113, 185, 227-30, 330
Sources of the Gospels, 8 f.
Stephen and the Law of Moses, 14, 337
Storm, Jesus, quieting, 127-9
Strack and Billerbeck, 40
Suffering of Jesus, Meaning of, 236-42, 264, 268, 290-2, 321 f., 352, 358-60, 366-9, 383, 388 f., 390 f.
Synagogue, Purpose of, 26-28, 82
  Ruler of, 27, 111
Synoptic problem, 2, 8 f.
Syro-Phoenician woman, 210-12

Tacitus, 146
Talmud, 3, 23 f.
Temple bazaar closed by Jesus, 81, 310-12
Temple, Jewish, 24-26, 309 f.
Temple tax, 273 f.
Temple to be destroyed, 337-42
Temptation of Jesus, 70-80, 217, 225 f.
Theophilus, 19
Thief on cross, 387 f.
Thompson, W. H., 190
Tiberias, 381
Timothy, 46
Tradition of elders, 14, 31 f.
  Opposed by Jesus, 120-3, 216
Transfiguration, 252 f., 256-9
Trial of Jesus, 374-83
  Legality of, 378
Tribute money, 322-6
Triumphal entry, 296-9
Twelve, selection of the, 117 f., 143 f.
Twelve sent out, 144-6
Tyre, Jesus in, 123, 209, 211-12

Virgin birth, 50 f., 70

Weber, Ferdinand, 110, 235
Widow, poor but generous, 336
Wünsche, August, 356

Zacchaeus, 292-4
Zadok, see Saddouk
Zealots, 35 f., 143
Zechariah, 335

Date Due

NOV 17 1995

FEB 15 1995

NOV 21 1995

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

232.9
B747

Bosworth, Edward Increase.
AUTHOR

The life and teaching of Jesus
TITLE according to the first three
Gospels

232.9
B747 Bosworth, Edward Increase
The life and teaching of
Jesus according to the
first three Gospels.

37335